

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY




3 9999 06422 234 0

GOVT. DOC.

FRAGILE

DO NOT
PHOTOCOPY



ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
BOARD OF ELECTION
COMMISSIONERS

FOR THE
YEAR 1898



BOSTON
MUNICIPAL PRINTING OFFICE
1899

9772

Boston Board of Election Commissioners.
Dec. 8, 1944.



BOSTON, February 20, 1899.

HON. JOSIAH QUINCY,

Mayor of the City of Boston :

SIR, — In compliance with the requirements of Section 24 of Chapter 3 of the Revised Ordinances, the Board of Election Commissioners respectfully submits its annual report for the year 1898.

We are pleased to state that the work of the department during the past year was carried on not only within the appropriation allowed by the City Council, but that a substantial balance remained to the credit of this department. This result was due principally to two causes. One of these was because there was less than the usual activity prior to both the State and City elections, and in consequence the number of registered voters was smaller by about four thousand than in the previous year, which was the basis of our estimate of probable expenditure during 1898. This year the voting-list for the city election contained the names of 98,457 male voters. Another cause which contributed to the reduced expenditure was the effect of the act of the last Legislature which provided that there should be no supplementary assessment after October 1.

There was very little supplementary registration in consequence, after this date, which made it unnecessary to add to the office force, as has heretofore been required in order to properly attend to registration and the other work of the office, at this, the busiest season of the year. In other ways, too, we have reduced expenses, and our efforts have been directed towards an economical administration of the department in every respect.

The laws governing the conduct of caucuses and elections are now in a much more satisfactory condition since the passage of Chapter 548 of the Acts of 1898, commonly known as the "Election Act of 1898." This codification has been of

great assistance in carrying on the work of the office, condensing and simplifying laws which previously in many respects were confusing and unsatisfactory.

CAUCUSES AND ELECTIONS.

During the year, in addition to the seven caucuses and two elections usually held, there have been two special caucuses and elections to fill vacancies in the Legislature, one in the eleventh Suffolk Representative District caused by the resignation of the incumbent to accept a high Federal office, and the other caused by the death of the senator from the Second Suffolk Senatorial District.

The caucuses were uniformly conducted in an orderly manner and the returns were generally made with promptness and accuracy. Yet there is room for improvement in this respect in some portions of the city where the delay in forwarding the returns is very great and the inaccuracies in such returns are beyond understanding. We recognize the fact that at the fall caucuses in some of the wards more votes are cast than at the subsequent elections, the great number of votes being caused by the large field of candidates striving for the nomination to the Legislature or the Common Council, or by the efforts of interested parties to secure delegates favorable to certain candidates for other elective offices. As the returns from these largely attended caucuses are not received until hours after the polls are closed, it cannot be claimed that lack of time is an excuse for the failure of the officers to make an accurate return of the result. To the credit of the caucus officers at most of these large caucuses it must be said that their returns are on the whole accurately made.

In the conduct of elections, too, there has been much to commend in the work of the election officers. We are fortunate in having at our service a large number of citizens who have had experience as election officers and who respond willingly to the demand made upon them for further service. The work of such officers is highly satisfactory, and were it not for the fact that a large minority of them is composed of

men totally inexperienced in such work there would in our opinion be little to criticise in the work of the election officers.

In one instance during the past year the returns of the election officers were of such a character as to call for inquiry and investigation by this Board. In this case the returns were so grossly inaccurate that all the election officers from the precinct were summoned before the Board and separately examined with a view to ascertaining and fixing the responsibility for the flagrant errors in the returns. The result of the examination by us was far from satisfactory, and was such as to leave in our minds some doubt as to whether one or two of such election officers acted honestly in the discharge of their duty, and we believed it to be our duty under the circumstances to report the matter to the District Attorney for such action by him as might be called for.

After a thorough examination by him of all the facts he concluded that the errors and inaccuracies were due to carelessness and neglect rather than to any criminal intent, and no proceedings therefore were instituted against them. We failed utterly to understand after careful oral and written instructions had been given these officers, two of whom had served in a similar capacity before, how they could have made such gross errors.

We desire to reiterate our opinion, emphatically expressed in the report of last year that the appointment of deputy election officers, as now required by law, is unnecessary and the saving of the amount paid to them for practically no service would be a substantial one. If the number of polling-places in the city should be increased, as is called for by many citizens, and which seems to us to be desirable in the interest of a more prompt canvass and return of votes we believe that the polling-places would be properly manned by a warden, clerk and two inspectors in each precinct, instead of four inspectors as at present.

This further reduction in the force of election officers in each precinct would save a large sum of money, and this change would be especially beneficial if the number of polling-places is increased.

We have noticed the past year a very great improvement in the preparation of nomination papers for candidates to be placed upon the official ballot, and we believe that the political committees and candidates now fully understand the importance of exercising great care in the preparation of such nomination papers and that they are solicitous to fulfil the requirements of law in this respect.

RECOUNTS.

Again we must call attention to the great abuse of the right to petition for recounts. No other State in the country gives such latitude in the right to petition in this regard. The past year has been simply a repetition of the experience of this Board in previous years. A very large number of petitions for recounts have been presented and acted upon where the difference in the return of votes did not justify such petitions, even under the most liberal view of the law. While the law, without the desired limitations, accords citizens the right to petition for recount of votes, such petitions will be numerous and must be acted upon. Could not some discretion be vested in this board? We understand that a proposition to bring about a change is now before the legislature, and we hope it will be favorably received. The abuse of the right to petition exists specially as regards caucuses, and is not generally felt at election recounts. The latter as a rule are justifiable.

During the past two years we have discovered a growing tendency in some localities, where politics are very active, no matter what condition exists elsewhere, to make use of pasters or ballots at caucuses, and when this was done within the statute, as we construed it, and in the absence of objections, the names so pasted were counted at all recounts held by us. This evil assumed greater proportions during the past year in these localities, and at the recounts following the fall caucuses objections were raised to counting blanket pasters which contained the names of all persons on the official ballot, and only those names, and which were so prepared that they could be marked by interested parties outside the polling-place, taken into the voting compartment by the voter, and pasted on or over the official ballot, given to him by the caucus officer. These blanket pasters in size of type and other respects were very similar to the official ballots.

After a careful consideration of the objections we decided them to be well taken, and refused to count such blanket pasters. We were of the opinion that they were not within

the law, and most palpably were an evasion of the spirit and intent of the Australian system of voting. At the time we prepared a full statement of our findings and our grounds therefor, which was printed in the daily papers. We are gratified to state that since our action, as above set forth, there has been no attempt to use blanket pasters at any caucus in the city.

The general recount after the last city election was conducted by this department under much more favorable circumstances than ever before. A large hall was secured in the immediate vicinity of our offices where sufficient floor space was available for twelve tables, at each of which two clerks were detailed to count the votes. We were enabled thereby to finish the work in four days instead of six as heretofore, and there was room not only for each of the numerous candidates affected by the petitions to be present and watch the count, but enabled us to allow each of the political committees of the two leading parties to have a representative present at each table. The recount proceeded without friction and we think to the entire satisfaction of the parties interested. We were so favorably impressed with the success of the change that we shall not in the future attempt to carry on as heretofore a general recount of the votes of the city in the small and ill-ventilated room which forms one of our offices for the general business of the department.

ELECTION BOOTHS AND POLLING-PLACES.

As was stated in our last annual report would be necessary, we were called upon this year to provide a large number of voting-booths to take the place of the seventy-five or more school-houses which previously the School Committee had allowed to be used as polling-places at elections. We have been obliged to vacate the school buildings for reasons which then seemed to us good and sufficient. After an investigation which lasted for a year we concluded to purchase one hundred booths to be made of thin corrugated steel, and bids were publicly advertised, a loan of \$30,000 for such booths and the furniture required therefor having been authorized by the City Council. Among the many competitors the Van Dorn Iron Works Company of Cleveland, Ohio, were the successful bidders and the contract was awarded to them. The booths were of a pattern, and, built of material similar to the booths used in other cities of the country at the fall elections, and we were informed that these booths had been used in a western city at an election in February, and

that they proved to be suitable for use in cold weather. The new steel booths were constructed in Cleveland in parts, were put together in Boston under the careful supervision and inspection of the City Engineer's Department, and were used for the first time at the State election early in November. So far as we know no valid objection was then raised against them. At the city election in December the weather was unusually severe, and with zero temperature the booths proved entirely unsuitable for voting purposes. Although the stove and fuel provided, we believed, would be sufficient to properly heat these booths, it proved insufficient, and the discomfort of the election officers on duty during the day, and in some cases well into the night, was very great. With a view to making these booths suitable for future use in cold weather, which may be reasonably expected at the city election, we have recently caused four of them to be lined with wooden sheathing and by practical use at a special election held on February 7, 1899, it was demonstrated that with such a lining the booths will be available for use in the future. This improvement is attended with so great an expense that it will be impossible to continue it with all the booths within the appropriation this year allowed the department by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment. The sum of \$7,000 additional will be required for the purpose.

In the early spring of 1898, during the excitement caused by the prospect of a war with Spain, we were called upon by the Mayor at the request of the State authorities to have the old booths ready to be used as temporary barracks for our troops when the call came for their enlistment into the service of the country. The summons came soon after, and the fifty-six knock-down wooden buildings, all in first-class condition, constituting our whole equipment, were turned over to the State. Most of them were sent to Fort Warren for the use of the First Regiment, while the remainder were loaned to the Naval Brigade. On the cessation of hostilities most of these booths were returned to us with a portion of the furniture and appointments loaned, but, as might naturally be expected, their condition was not the same as when they left our hands. The expense of moving and repairing these buildings, which was large, was by agreement to be borne by the State. A statement of the full amount due the city has been submitted to the State authorities, a part only of which has been allowed and paid. Another demand came later for the use of these wooden buildings at the City Hospital, to care for the sick and convalescent soldiers returning

from active duty. We were also called upon to loan thirteen of these wooden booths to the Bath Department. They have not been returned to us, and no compensation has been paid for their use. These thirteen booths, with the twelve now remaining on the hospital grounds, will be greatly needed another year for election purposes. Without them we shall be seriously embarrassed. In the situation in which we found ourselves in the early autumn of 1898, having an insufficient number of booths, including the new steel buildings, for polling-places, we were obliged to have twenty new wooden buildings constructed. These new wooden booths are of a smaller size than the old ones, but are amply sufficient. Their first cost is much less, and as they can be moved without being taken to pieces, as is necessary with the old booths, there will be a substantial saving in this regard.

If funds are provided to make the steel booths comfortable in cold weather, as above suggested, we shall not be obliged to provide additional accommodations for polling-places. Otherwise it will be necessary to have more of these wooden booths constructed at an expense of \$175 apiece, unless we secure from the School Committee again the right to use a sufficient number of school buildings. As stated above, we believed in 1897 that the objections of the School Committee to the use of their buildings for election purposes were reasonable; but the conditions are now changed, and in the present financial condition of the city, we believe, rather than incur the large expense of building new booths or hiring stores or houses which we have found cannot be done at reasonable prices, that the School Committee should allow the use on election days of some of their buildings for polling-places. It should be said, too, in this connection that many citizens have complained the past year because they were not allowed to vote in school-houses as heretofore, which they claim are much more comfortable and suitable than the voting-booths.

JURORS.

The present system of preparing the jury-list by this Board seems on the whole to meet with the approval of the public, and secures men of the character and intelligence desired for such service. The selection of names is made by us during the months of January and February in each year as provided by law, and the jury-list for the year 1899 will be submitted to the Board of Aldermen prior to March 1 for its approval.

The names are selected by us from the general register of voters, which is each year prepared from the returns of the

assessors submitted to us between May 1 and July 1. As a rule, we do not consult the supplementary registration in selecting names for jurors, as it is so largely made up from the floating population of the city, which class is not desirable to draw upon for jurors. There has been some surprise manifested that names drawn by the Board of Aldermen from the jury-list prepared by us prove in some cases to be those of non-residents. When these persons appear in court in response to the summons this fact is disclosed, and they are for this reason excused as they are exempt from such service in this city. All such cases when brought to our attention are investigated, and in no instance has it been found to be an error chargeable to us. These persons were residents of the city on May 1, according to the returns of the assessors, and having been on the voting-list the previous year their names were continued on the list. They acquired a residence elsewhere by moving out of the city between May 1 and the time when they were drawn as jurors, which may have been more than a year later, as the jury-list prepared by us in January and February is the list for the twelve months following. The only remedy for this which occurs to us, and that is only a partial one, is to amend the law so that this Board shall be required to select the names at an earlier date, say in July or August. In this event six months would be gained in the preparation of the list. In the autumn months the other work of the department is so great that it would be a difficult matter to properly prepare the jury-list at that time.

The exemptions from jury service allowed by law include so large a body of citizens that we believe such exemptions should be reduced. We see no good and sufficient reason why members of the volunteer militia and of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company should be relieved from serving as jurors, and we believe that an advantage would be gained if the limit of age were increased from sixty-five to seventy years. We therefore recommend such changes in the law. As the term of service of jurors is now so short, we believe it would be wise and expedient to further change the law, so that a person shall be liable to be drawn and serve as a juror once in two years, instead of three years as at present.

As the Ballot Law Commission of the City of Boston, we were called upon during the past year to hear and determine but a single case, which was not of special interest to the public. Objection was made to a nomination paper to fill a vacancy caused by the withdrawal of a caucus nominee in Ward 6, on the ground that no vote was passed by the

caucus authorizing the filling of such vacancy. The evidence was adjudged to be insufficient to sustain such objection.

During the past year two complaints only for illegal registration were filed in this department. Summons were issued in both cases, and hearings took place under the new method of procedure in such cases, established by the Legislature of 1898. In one case the evidence was found to be sufficient to sustain the complaint, and a transfer of the person complained of was made from one precinct to another of the same ward. In the other case the evidence was deemed to be insufficient, and the complaint was dismissed. We believe the change in the method of procedure in these cases, above referred to, was called for, after our experience in 1897, as was fully stated in our report for that year, and in which we suggested this change in the law among other changes, and gave the reasons therefor. It seemed to us only right and proper that at least forty-eight hours, instead of twenty-four hours, should be the minimum limit of time intervening between the issue of the summons and the date of hearing, in order that the person complained of should have time to answer the complaint; and the requirement that the complainant should be obliged to make out a *prima facie* case at least, in case of the non-appearance of the person complained of in response to the summons, we believed to be called for, in order that the procedure and the rules of evidence should conform more nearly to those of judicial proceedings. One important matter though was overlooked by the Legislature in considering changes in the law in these cases. The complainant should be entitled to process to summon witnesses to sustain the complaint, and an adequate penalty should be attached to the failure to respond to such summons.

We have herein referred to the Election Act of 1898 as being of great assistance to us in carrying on the work of this department.

Though errors and omissions in this codification of the laws regulating caucuses and elections have come to our attention, they are of little importance and we did not feel called upon so soon to recommend to the present Legislature any changes in the law. We think though we should allude to one defect in the law which we encountered the past year.

A recount of votes cast at a caucus resulted in a tie for the third place in the nomination for the Common Council. There was not sufficient time to call a new caucus, and the time for filing nomination papers had expired. Two names only therefore could be placed upon the official ballot, instead of three to which the political party was entitled. A pro-

vision of law allowing the executive committee of the political party to fill a vacancy existing under such circumstances would be all that is required.

EXPENSES.

At the beginning of the year the Board submitted as an estimate of the probable expenditures of the department the sum of \$145,000, but the City Council appropriated therefor the sum of \$137,000. A further sum of \$30,000 was provided by special loan for the purchase of 100 steel voting-booths, and the furniture and fixtures required therefor.

There has actually been expended by this department during the year 1898, chargeable, to the regular appropriation the sum of \$130,190.67; and on account of the Special Loan for new voting-booths the sum of \$29,595.73. There remained therefore to the credit of this department on the first account the sum of \$6,809.33, and on the second account the sum of \$404.27.

The expenditures of the department in detail for the financial year ending January 31, 1899, are as follows:

SALARIES:	
Commissioners	\$14,500 00
Secretary to June 4, 1898	1,069 45
Assistant Registrars and Messenger	29,002 03
	<hr/>
	\$44,571 48
Election officers	22,407 00
Printing	20,845 83
Repairs and fitting up precinct polling-places	10,375 65
Fitting up booths for Army use, and repairing when returned . .	6,303 66
Carriage hire and travelling expenses, caucuses and elections . .	4,160 45
Twenty new wooden booths	3,789 53
Rents	3,685 12
Copying polls from Assessors' books	3,594 46
Care of voting-places	3,415 45
Posting voting-lists, sample ballots, locations of polling-places and carting	2,617 83
Advertising	2,058 83
Furniture	1,511 42
Stationery	1,447 31
	<hr/>

Carried forward \$130,784 02

<i>Brought forward</i> . . .	\$130,784 02
Incidentals	912 60
Refreshments, employees, police and hackmen, caucuses and elections .	709 95
Telephone service	235 13
Fuel, gas and electric light . . .	208 97
Maps	110 50
Repairs of ballot-boxes	72 75
Typewriting	57 29
Constables' services	55 00

\$133,146 21

Less amount refunded by the
Commonwealth of Massachu-
setts for expense incurred in
transporting and putting up
voting-booths at Fort Warren,

2,955 54

\$130,190 67

*Special Loan for New Steel Voting-
booths and Furnishings.*

100 Voting-booths :—

Van Dorn Iron Works Company,	\$26,700 00
Furniture	2,133 60
Carpentry, blocking, etc.	522 01
Inspector's services	233 56
Car fares and cartage	6 56

29,595 73

\$159,786 40

The following pages show in tabulated form the number of assessed polls, registered voters and votes cast in this city at the State, municipal and two special elections held in 1898.

Respectfully submitted,

LINUS E. PEARSON,
TIMOTHY F. McDONOUGH,
GEORGE P. SANGER,
JOSEPH J. CORBETT,

Board of Election Commissioners.

TABULATED STATEMENT

OF

ASSESSED POLLS, REGISTERED VOTERS,
AND VOTES CAST AT STATE AND
MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS,

1898.

Registered Voters (Men), State Election, 1898.

Wards.	PRECINCTS.									Totals.	Per cent. As- sessed Polls Registered by wards.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.		
1.....	358	406	548	479	518	474	596	571	238	4,188	66.36
2.....	521	425	491	446	371	472	535	619	3,880	59.73
3.....	432	546	469	602	577	449	3,075	71.48
4.....	484	369	481	504	515	371	2,724	66.96
5.....	453	556	484	356	550	434	2,833	63.25
6.....	475	512	597	615	613	329	524	456	4,121	45.96
7.....	365	347	429	359	494	498	2,492	47.94
8.....	559	631	443	673	669	670	3,645	46.28
9.....	569	632	528	575	489	375	545	3,713	44.75
10.....	405	403	338	405	335	442	630	610	384	3,952	53.72
11.....	443	522	518	518	398	323	442	367	394	3,925	62.53
12.....	512	485	390	519	486	599	446	3,437	55.20
13.....	505	543	491	507	504	421	484	465	3,920	51.42
14.....	771	654	460	450	533	487	585	551	4,491	72.32
15.....	329	529	500	459	471	446	507	492	3,733	68.79
16.....	472	583	653	587	500	473	677	3,945	71.66
17.....	457	442	409	522	422	427	466	631	441	4,217	60.67
18.....	544	604	573	721	681	695	3,818	52.71
19.....	523	520	667	540	451	542	680	559	4,482	63.10
20.....	707	674	570	580	770	664	702	670	5,337	70.37
21.....	469	504	337	474	496	452	581	582	523	4,418	69.84
22.....	761	578	480	602	582	437	502	550	4,492	64.36
23.....	335	453	463	471	661	553	417	455	300	4,113	69.98
24.....	466	434	604	466	450	459	613	740	513	4,745	67.77
25.....	562	498	445	477	497	521	542	3,542	64.65
Total.....	97,238	

Average per cent. of men assessed who registered, 60.33.

Number of Votes cast for Governor at State Election, 1898.

Wards.	PRECINCT 1.						PRECINCT 2.					
	BRUCE (Democratic).	PEARE (Soc. Labor).	PORTER (Dem., Soc., Nom. Paper).	SHAPLEIGH (Prohibition).	WOLCOTT (Republican).	Scattering.	BRUCE (Democratic).	PEARE (Soc. Labor).	PORTER (Dem., Soc., Nom. Paper).	SHAPLEIGH (Prohibition).	WOLCOTT (Republican).	Scattering.
1	50	7	2	205	..	28	1	5	286	..
2	261	6	10	1	87	..	187	1	1	1	80	..
3	83	2	1	1	218	..	248	6	5	1	117	..
4	222	4	3	1	112	..	70	3	1	178	..
5	101	2	3	2	223	..	229	1	2	2	165	..
6	248	1	2	1	59	..	245	7	1	1	8	..
7	105	2	1	2	134	..	107	2	2	1	93	..
8	340	14	12	11	89	..	259	16	9	1	151	..
9	195	14	5	1	139	..	237	14	4	4	142	..
10	98	8	2	1	92	..	72	4	1	1	178	..
11	70	6	1	5	240	..	85	1	1	2	260	..
12	50	3	2	3	291	..	39	3	1	4	31	..
13	289	6	6	1	45	..	277	10	4	1	49	..
14	398	8	5	8	145	..	392	8	1	2	59	..
15	124	5	1	1	82	..	269	6	1	1	68	..
16	171	14	2	2	131	..	227	11	4	3	136	..
17	235	7	1	68	..	216	1	1	3	73	..
18	219	10	4	2	135	..	196	16	5	4	151	..
19	211	14	6	4	122	..	203	11	3	4	133	..
20	162	4	5	3	364	..	144	2	3	337	1
21	78	4	4	202	..	129	5	1	4	199	..
22	176	38	5	2	307	1	239	13	6	2	113	..
23	70	3	3	3	201	..	222	6	2	1	100	..
24	147	4	1	2	143	..	132	8	1	1	177	..
25	107	2	1	2	240	..	53	3	1	8	271	..

**Number of Votes cast for Governor at State Election,
1898. — *Continued.***

PRECINCT 3.						PRECINCT 4.						Wards.
BRUCE (Democratic).	PEARE (Soc. Labor).	PORTER (Dem., Soc., Nom. Paper).	SHAPLEIGH (Prohibition).	WOLCOTT (Republican).	Scattering.	BRUCE (Democratic).	PEARE (Soc. Labor).	PORTER (Dem., Soc., Nom. Paper).	SHAPLEIGH (Prohibition).	WOLCOTT (Republican).	Scattering.	
74	4	2	4	336	..	45	2	5	302 1
228	4	1	131	..	237	5	3	1	90 2
199	2	5	3	159	..	350	3	3	73 3
135	2	2	4	226	..	231	9	6	3	161 4
231	7	8	51	..	128	5	5	1	79 5
243	8	1	2	107	..	210	3	9	63 6
150	9	4	3	120	..	53	7	1	2	136 7
63	6	1	8	235	..	316	13	13	3	153 8
282	9	3	3	62	..	235	13	5	3	125 9
27	5	1	1	192	1	33	3	2	5	211 10
197	4	1	4	233	..	73	1	270	3 11
82	3	2	179	..	95	2	6	259 12
239	17	1	2	51	..	253	15	3	20	45 13
206	3	1	1	133	..	154	3	196 14
218	6	2	110	..	198	1	1	3	145 15
250	6	1	212	..	100	9	2	4	326 16
109	3	2	3	192	..	156	1	2	2	220 17
112	19	2	1	228	..	206	5	3	4	229 18
367	16	14	2	91	..	273	4	6	1	118 19
152	3	267	..	232	2	1	164 20
56	2	3	151	..	70	5	7	246	1 21
228	2	1	1	82	..	133	18	3	5	251 22
214	10	5	1	113	..	183	5	2	2	152 23
115	2	2	5	287	..	135	2	2	1	211 24
42	1	12	262	..	212	5	1	83 25

**Number of Votes cast for Governor at State Election,
1898. — *Continued.***

Wards.	PRECINCT 5.						PRECINCT 6.					
	BRUCE (Democratic).	PEARE (Soc. Labor).	PORTER (Dem., Soc., Nom. Paper).	SHAPLEIGH (Prohibition).	WOLCOTT (Republican).	Scattering.	BRUCE (Democratic).	PEARE (Soc. Labor).	PORTER* (Dem., Soc., Nom. Paper).	SHAPLEIGH (Prohibition).	WOLCOTT (Republican).	Scattering.
1	100	3	5	2	233	..	238	4	6	1	83	..
2	179	2	5	1	77	..	192	8	2	4	113	..
3	326	9	1	2	84	..	273	5	3	52	..
4	284	8	25	24	41	..	126	6	3	3	132	..
5	256	4	3	4	114	..	153	2	2	2	89	..
6	150	8	4	2	183	..	50	5	1	4	182	..
7	268	8	5	1	57	..	259	7	1	1	77	..
8	316	30	16	3	154	..	297	9	8	3	158	..
9	118	3	2	1	197	..	85	5	2	169	..
10	15	6	169	..	33	3	3	258	1
11	24	242	..	18	1	221	2
12	68	1	1	5	246	..	241	9	4	1	169	..
13	266	13	5	3	78	..	203	3	1	78	..
14	166	10	4	233	..	136	6	221	..
15	203	9	2	2	139	..	132	13	4	6	174	..
16	123	6	2	3	242	..	29	3	4	342	..
17	201	5	1	2	91	..	237	5	6	2	64	..
18	332	13	13	1	98	..	261	16	4	6	170	..
19	181	11	1	1	128	..	215	9	3	158	..
20	164	3	4	341	..	105	7	1	5	416	..
21	100	3	4	231	..	37	3	1	5	284	..
22	135	33	6	3	213	..	41	6	3	6	255	..
23	161	22	4	6	271	..	52	18	2	3	316	..
24	71	3	2	4	269	..	122	5	2	1	215	..
25	204	3	2	156	..	118	1	2	1	246	..

**Number of Votes cast for Governor at State Election,
1898. — Concluded.**

Wards.	PRECINCT 9.					TOTALS.						
	BRUCE (Democratic).	PEARE (Soc. Labor).	PORTER (Dem., Soc., Non. Paper).	SHAPLEIGH (Prohibition).	WOLCOTT (Republican).	BRUCE (Democratic).	PEARE (Socialist Labor).	PORTER (Dem., Soc., Non. Paper).	SHAPLEIGH (Prohibition).	WOLCOTT* (Republican).	Scattering.	For all Guber- natorial Can- didates.
1.	44	5	1	121	970	36	17	26	1,978	..	3,027
2.	1,881	37	31	15	736	..	2,700
3.	1,479	27	15	10	703	..	2,234
4.	1,068	32	39	36	850	..	2,025
5.	1,098	21	23	11	721	..	1,874
6.	1,548	54	15	19	762	..	2,398
7.	942	35	14	10	617	..	1,618
8.	1,591	88	59	29	940	..	2,707
9.	1,447	63	24	16	917	..	2,467
10	35	2	185	429	31	7	36	1,922	2	2,427
11.	21	258	436	12	4	15	2,261	7	2,735
12.	761	28	9	24	1,580	..	2,402
13.	2,051	78	28	28	460	..	2,645
14.	1,888	42	7	30	1,358	..	3,325
15.	1,519	71	16	17	1,028	..	2,651
16.	1,178	53	16	18	1,603	..	2,868
17.	157	1	6	2	195	1,832	46	28	21	1,139	..	3,066
18.	1,326	79	31	18	1,011	..	2,465
19.	2,027	102	46	15	1,055	..	3,245
20.	1,148	32	12	67	2,621	1	3,881
21.	81	2	5	276	740	30	3	35	2,181	3	2,992
22.	1,200	122	32	28	1,688	1	3,071
23.	97	3	1	3	114	1,109	78	20	25	1,829	..	3,061
24.	111	6	3	55	201	1,053	44	16	77	2,198	..	3,388
25.	957	18	8	25	1,417	..	2,425
Grand Totals.....						31,678	1,259	520	651	33,575	14	67,697

* Elected.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 69.62 per cent.

**Votes cast for State Officers (except Governor), State Election,
1898, in the City of Boston.**

CANDIDATES FOR LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.	VOTES CAST.
Berry, Socialist Labor.....	1,735
*Crane, Republican.....	31,239
Kilbon, Prohibition.....	680
Skinner, Democratic, Social. Nom. Paper.....	963
Slattery, Democratic.....	32,058
Scattering.....	2
Total.....	66,677

Proportion of men registered who voted, ~~62.08~~ per cent.

68.57

CANDIDATES FOR SECRETARY OF STATE.	VOTES CAST.
Bradley, Democratic, Social. Nom. Paper.....	1,711
Inman, Prohibition.....	714
Lloyd, Democratic.....	30,318
*Olin, Republican.....	30,579
Stevens, Socialist Labor.....	1,881
Scattering.....	1
Total.....	65,204

Proportion of men registered who voted, ~~60.23~~ per cent.

67.06

CANDIDATES FOR TREASURER AND RECEIVER-GENERAL.	VOTES CAST.
Avery, Socialist Labor.....	2,168
Jaquith, Democratic.....	30,766
*Shaw, Republican.....	29,793
Small, Prohibition.....	641
White, Democratic, Social. Nom. Paper.....	944
Scattering.....	1
Total.....	64,313

*Elected.

Proportion of men registered who voted, ~~80.20~~ per cent.

66.14

**Votes cast for State Officers (except Governor), State Election,
1898, in the City of Boston — Concluded.**

CANDIDATES FOR AUDITOR.	VOTES CAST.
Grieves, Democratic, Social. Nom. Paper.....	1,160
*Kimball, Republican.....	29,595
Palme, Socialist Labor.....	1,677
Parker, Democratic.....	31,150
Sanford, Prohibition.....	709
Scattering.....	1
Total	64,292

Proportion of men registered who voted, ~~67.27~~ ^{66.12} per cent.

CANDIDATES FOR ATTORNEY-GENERAL.	VOTES CAST.
Kilroy, Democratic.....	32,533
*Knowlton, Republican.....	30,919
Spelman, Socialist Labor.....	1,643
Scattering.....	2
Total	65,097

* Elected. ^{66.95}
Proportion of men registered who voted, ~~66.66~~ per cent.

Votes cast for Councillors, State Election, 1898.

SECOND DISTRICT.

Wards.	DAVIS,* Rep.	DUNHAM, Dem.	Scattering.
16.....	1,429	1,256	
20.....	2,470	1,310	
21.....	2,102	831	
22.....	1,607	1,265	1
23.....	1,691	1,241	
24.....	2,102	1,169	
Totals	11,401	7,072	1

* Elected.

Registered voters, 27,050.

Votes cast, 18,474.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 68.29 per cent.

The balance of this district comprises the First Bristol and the First and Second Norfolk Senatorial Districts.

Votes cast for Councillors, State Election, 1898.

THIRD DISTRICT.

Wards.	SWALLOW,* Rep.	Scattering.
1	1,922	
3	987	
4	991	3
5	1,002	
Totals	4,902	3

* Elected.

Registered voters, 12,820.

Votes cast, 4,905

Proportion of men registered who voted, 38.26 per cent.

The balance of this district comprises Chelsea, Revere, Winthrop and the First, Second and Third Middlesex Senatorial Districts.

FOURTH DISTRICT.

Wards.	HOLDEN, Rep.	M McNAMARA, Dem. Ind. Nom. Paper.	QUIRK,* Dem.
2	612	206	1,823
6	645	318	1,509
7	518	251	772
8	798	997	813
9	781	329	1,275
10	1,883	80	430
11	2,189	105	402
12	1,480	184	691
13	260	1,533	853
14	1,143	824	1,255
15	832	777	977
17	970	263	1,766
18	898	410	1,091
19	881	384	1,889
25	1,353	144	894
Totals	15,243	6,805	16,440

* Elected.

Registered voters, 57,368.

Votes cast, 38,488.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 67.09 per cent.

Votes cast for Congressmen, State Election, 1898.

SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

Ward 4.	MAILONEY, Soc. Lab.	RAMSDELL, Dem.	ROBERTS,* Rep.
Precinct 1.....	3	274	67
“ 2.....	2	93	152
“ 3.....	2	160	201
“ 4.....	13	240	123
“ 5.....	6	310	39
“ 6.....	31	137	86
Totals.....	57	1,214	668
•			
Ward 5.			
Precinct 1.....	2	125	194
“ 2.....	2	258	141
“ 3.....	9	250	37
“ 4.....	6	137	74
“ 5.....	9	287	90
“ 6.....	5	160	78
Totals.....	33	1,217	614
Grand totals.....	90	2,431	1,282

* Elected.

Registered voters, 5,557.

Votes cast, 3,803.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 68.44 per cent.

The balance of this district is composed of Chelsea, Everett, Lynn, Malden, Melrose, Nahant, Revere, Saugus, Stoneham and Wakefield.

Votes Cast on the Question: Shall Licenses Be Granted for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors in this City?—Municipal Election, 1899.

Wards.	Yes.	No.
1	1,830	1,418
2	2,198	900
3	1,640	890
4	1,315	746
5	1,571	694
6	1,999	753
7	1,259	665
8	2,057	830
9	1,868	944
10	1,734	961
11	2,143	789
12	1,688	1,076
13	1,845	1,064
14	2,124	1,421
15	1,666	1,138
16	1,892	1,225
17	2,094	1,299
18	1,923	1,132
19	2,608	1,029
20	2,530	2,039
21	2,415	1,533
22	2,554	1,302
23	2,093	1,523
24	2,135	2,016
25	1,801	1,183
Totals.....	48,982	28,570

Proportion of men registered who voted, 75.38 per cent.

Votes Cast on the Question: Shall Chapter 344 of the Acts of the Year 1899, entitled "An Act to Make Eight Hours a Day's Work for City and Town Employees," Be Accepted?—Municipal Election, 1899.

Wards.	Yes.	No.
1	2,564	574
2	2,752	267
3	2,234	264
4	1,686	309
5	1,911	289
6	2,428	299
7	1,622	247
8	2,505	336
9	2,468	310
0	1,808	762
11	1,510	1,256
12	2,045	608
13	2,643	241
14	3,011	487
15	2,329	413
16	2,442	603
17	2,840	472
18	2,601	346
19	3,143	488
20	3,204	1,178
21	2,631	1,156
22	2,780	857
23	2,592	903
24	2,898	1,115
25	2,189	703
Totals	60,836	14,483

Proportion of men registered who voted, 73.21 per cent.

Votes cast for Congressmen, State Election, 1898.

EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

Ward 10.		McCALL,* Rep.	PERKINS, Dem.	STACEY, Soc. Lab.
Precinct 1.....		85	108	8
" 2.....		164	80	5
" 3.....		184	39	4
" 4.....		208	31	9
" 5.....		159	19	2
" 6.....		239	48	2
" 7.....		323	65	7
" 8.....		286	78	11
" 9.....		174	42	1
Totals		1,822	510	49
Ward 11.				
Precinct 1.....		230	79	6
" 2.....		213	116	5
" 3.....		200	131	9
" 4.....		239	100	2
" 5.....		237	30	1
" 6.....		220	20	
" 7.....		277	32	
" 8.....		253	18	1
" 9.....		244	29	6
Totals		2,113	555	30
Grand totals.....		3,935	1,065	79

* Elected.

Registered voters, 7,877.

Votes cast, 5,079.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 64.48 per cent.

The balance of this district is composed of Arlington, Cambridge, Medford, Somerville and Winchester.

Votes cast for Congressmen, State Election, 1898.

NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

Ward 1.		BRADMAN, Rep. Cit. Nom.	FITZGER- ALD,* Dem.	GALLIVAN, Dem. Ind. Nom.	KREBS, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	6	60	15	186	
" 2	5	40	13	257	
" 3	7	86	23	294	
" 4	13	60	20	254	
" 5	4	123	39	186	
" 6	2	232	43	66	
" 7	9	207	40	169	
" 8	6	215	53	138	
" 9	3	68	13	86	
Totals		55	1,091	259	1,636	
Ward 2.						
Precinct 1	5	269	46	71	
" 2	3	192	40	57	
" 3	1	227	50	99	
" 4	1	244	41	56	
" 5	5	179	37	55	
" 6	4	193	39	88	
" 7	3	263	64	44	
" 8	4	323	61	67	
Totals		26	1,890	378	537	
Ward 3.						
Precinct 1	19	85	27	170	1
" 2	16	205	90	81	
" 3	11	169	85	107	
" 4	4	278	122	32	
" 5	6	268	102	54	
" 6	2	241	77	28	
Totals		58	1,246	503	472	1
Ward 6.						
Precinct 1	4	262	50	23	
" 2	4	262	69	33	
" 3	8	264	69	56	
" 4	4	279	47	34	
" 5	10	234	54	93	
" 6	28	60	13	137	
" 7	11	240	46	58	
" 8	1	243	58	13	
Totals		70	1,844	406	447	

* Elected.

Votes cast for Congressmen, State Election, 1898.

NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT — *Concluded.*

Ward 7.		BRADMAN, Rep., Cit. Nom.	FITZGER- ALD,* Dem.	GALLIVAN, Dem. Ind. Nom.	KREBS, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	16	103	36	88	
" 2	4	105	27	70	
" 3	16	150	59	80	
" 4	17	75	11	104	
" 5	4	236	76	31	
" 6	6	247	65	34	
Totals	63	916	274	407	
Ward 8.						
Precinct 1	4	62	309	40	
" 2	13	155	184	93	
" 3	21	60	38	190	
" 4	13	150	234	104	
" 5	6	189	231	100	
" 6	8	156	248	67	
Totals	65	772	1,244	594	
Ward 9.						
Precinct 1	14	218	34	82	
" 2	9	223	66	99	
" 3	1	270	86	34	
" 4	6	219	60	96	
" 5	14	103	46	159	
" 6	11	86	26	138	
" 7	6	254	61	55	
Totals	61	1,373	379	663	
Ward 13.						
Precinct 1	1	149	214	12	
" 2	2	176	166	18	
" 3	2	88	251	11	
" 4	2	134	228	29	
" 5	1	141	196	38	
" 6	2	102	151	46	
" 7		165	167	27	
" 8	1	116	157	24	
Totals	11	1,071	1,530	205	
Grand totals	409	10,203	4,973	4,961	1

*Elected.

Registered voters, 29,034.

Votes cast, 20,547.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 70.79 per cent.

This district includes also the town of Winthrop.

Votes cast for Congressmen, State Election, 1898.

TENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

Ward 12.		BARROWS, Rep.	NAPHEN,* Dem.	Scattering
Precinct 1	253	91	
" 2	278	74	
" 3	151	111	
" 4	226	138	
" 5	226	96	
" 6	141	278	
" 7	90	241	
Totals		1,365	1,029	
Ward 14.				
Precinct 1	118	454	
" 2	52	423	
" 3	108	240	
" 4	175	174	
" 5	205	200	
" 6	190	176	
" 7	155	264	
" 8	165	244	
Totals		1,168	2,175	
Ward 15.				
Precinct 1	71	148	1
" 2	42	315	
" 3	89	255	
" 4	115	239	
" 5	99	261	
" 6	156	171	
" 7	133	226	
" 8	121	250	
Totals		826	1,865	1
Ward 16.				
Precinct 1	112	210	
" 2	112	276	
" 3	174	288	1
" 4	299	132	1
" 5	208	168	
" 6	317	52	
" 7	165	340	
Totals		1,387	1,466	2

* Elected.

Votes cast for Congressmen, State Election, 1898.

TENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — *Continued.*

Ward 17.		BARROWS, Rep.	NAPHEN,* Dem.	Scattering
Precinct 1	35	269	
" 2	58	241	
" 3	160	142	
" 4	203	180	
" 5	70	232	
" 6	35	275	
" 7	76	269	
" 8	135	312	
" 9	164	184	
Totals.....		936	2,104	
Ward 18.				
Precinct 1	95	275	
" 2	131	255	
" 3	197	158	
" 4	185	260	
" 5	79	379	
" 6	149	287	
Totals		836	1,614	
Ward 19.				
Precinct 1	86	251	
" 2	79	281	
" 3	38	473	
" 4	79	308	
" 5	101	225	
" 6	120	270	
" 7	125	399	
" 8	70	344	
Totals		698	2,551	
Ward 20.				
Precinct 1	301	211	1
" 2	317	176	
" 3	240	184	1
" 4	135	276	1
" 5	311	215	
" 6	386	137	
" 7	357	150	
" 8	362	117	
Totals		2,409	1,466	3

* Elected.

Votes cast for Congressmen, State Election, 1898.**TENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — *Concluded.***

Ward 24.	BARROWS, Rep.	NAPHEN,* Dem.	Scattering
Precinct 1	125	189	
" 2	158	163	
" 3	268	137	
" 4	193	154	
" 5	243	104	
" 6	188	163	
" 7	292	133	
" 8	326	188	
" 9	235	136	
Totals	2,028	1,367	
Grand totals.....	11,653	15,637	6

Registered voters 38,205.

Votes cast, 27,296.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 71.45 per cent.

The balance of this district is composed of Milton and Quincy.

Votes cast for Congressmen, State Election, 1898.**ELEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.**

Ward 21.	BAKER, Dem.	SPRAGUE,* Rep.	Scattering
Precinct 1	99	194	
" 2	152	182	
" 3	77	130	
" 4	93	233	
" 5	121	221	
" 6	60	265	
" 7	148	234	1
" 8	78	326	
" 9	103	257	
Totals	931	2,042	1

Ward 22.			
Precinct 1	218	294	1
" 2	265	99	
" 3	246	61	
" 4	145	223	
" 5	181	182	
" 6	73	237	
" 7	80	278	
" 8	222	155	
Totals	1,430	1,529	1

*Elected.

Votes cast for Congressmen, State Election, 1898.
ELEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — Concluded.

Ward 23.		BAKER, Dem.	SPRAGUE,* Rep.	Scattering
Precinct 1	86	193	
" 2	251	82	
" 3	245	93	
" 4	209	137	
" 5	207	245	
" 6	104	275	
" 7	93	240	
" 8	68	276	
" 9	111	104	
Totals		1,374	1,645	
Ward 25.				
Precinct 1	132	210	
" 2	69	263	
" 3	65	251	
" 4	241	62	
" 5	231	129	
" 6	151	217	
" 7	249	153	
Totals		1,138	1,285	
Grand totals		4,873	6,501	2

Registered voters, 16,565.

Votes cast, 11,376.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 68.67 per cent.

The balance of this district comprises Newton, Bellingham, Belmont, Brookline, Dedham, Dover, Foxboro', Franklin, Holliston, Hopedale, Hyde Park, Medfield, Medway, Milford, Millis, Needham, Norfolk, North Attleboro', Norwood, Sharon, Sherborn, Walpole, Watertown and Wrentham.

Votes cast for Senator, State Election, 1898.

FIRST SENATORIAL DISTRICT.

Ward 1.		EFFORD, Soc. Lab.	HOWARD, Dem.	WITT,* Rep.
Precinct 1	6	51	202
" 2	2	37	272
" 3	5	67	340
" 4	4	45	298
" 5	7	99	228
" 6	6	225	95
" 7	9	179	230
" 8	10	202	187
" 9	5	49	110
Totals		54	954	1,962

* Elected.

Registered voters, 4,188.

Votes cast, 2,970.

Proportion of men registered who voted 70.92 per cent.

The balance of this district is composed of Chelsea, Revere and Winthrop.

Votes cast for Senator, State Election, 1898.

SECOND SENATORIAL DISTRICT.

Ward 3.		CARTER, Rep.	TAGUE,* Dem.
Precinct 1		196	104
“ 2		94	290
“ 3		127	228
“ 4		50	387
“ 5		51	373
“ 6		38	309
Totals		556	1,691
Ward 4.			
Precinct 1		79	256
“ 2		162	83
“ 3		203	145
“ 4		124	242
“ 5		44	310
“ 6		119	139
Totals		731	1,175
Ward 5.			
Precinct 1		207	115
“ 2		131	266
“ 3		34	266
“ 4		73	144
“ 5		89	300
“ 6		77	167
Totals		611	1,258
Grand totals		1,898	4,124

* Elected.

Registered voters, 8,632.

Votes cast, 6,022.

Proportion of men registered who voted 69.76 per cent.

The balance of this district is composed of Ward 3 of Cambridge.

Votes cast for Senator, State Election, 1898.

THIRD SENATORIAL DISTRICT.

Ward 2.	JOHN DONOVAN, Dem. Bryan Nom. paper.	WILLIAM J. DONOVAN,* Dem.	PINKOFSKY, Rep. Nom. paper.	ROURKE, Dem. Cit. Nom. paper.
Precinct 1	7	283	8	85
" 2	13	177	5	79
" 3	10	229	9	115
" 4	10	242	10	84
" 5	6	183	5	77
" 6	17	223	13	65
" 7	13	262	6	78
" 8	15	311	9	105
Totals	91	1,910	65	688
Ward 6.				
Precinct 1	12	148	3	169
" 2	13	169	7	176
" 3	19	151	12	212
" 4	18	182	3	143
" 5	11	133	37	199
" 6	6	55	64	101
" 7	12	155	31	146
" 8	18	136	6	147
Totals	109	1,129	163	1,293
Ward 8.				
Precinct 1	17	69	44	293
" 2	23	128	45	228
" 3	9	58	65	162
" 4	27	120	56	281
" 5	25	143	74	267
" 6	16	152	36	255
Totals	117	670	320	1,486
Grand totals	317	3,709	548	3,467

* Elected.

Registered voters, 11,646.

Votes cast, 8,041.

Proportion of men registered who voted 69.05 per cent.

Votes cast for Senator, State Election, 1898.

FOURTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT.

Ward 7.	COOPER, Rep. McKinley Nom. paper.	KELIHER,* Dem.	LUNDY, Rep.
Precinct 1	20	113	100
" 2	14	114	51
" 3	18	165	84
" 4	10	68	107
" 5	5	282	30
" 6	8	264	44
Totals	75	1,006	416

Ward 9.			
Precinct 1	22	240	79
" 2	25	266	78
" 3	7	322	30
" 4	16	260	89
" 5	29	136	144
" 6	20	104	127
" 7	6	316	58
Totals	125	1,644	605

Ward 17.			
Precinct 1	10	254	40
" 2	13	234	43
" 3	20	130	153
" 4	27	161	182
" 5	13	213	74
" 6	6	244	50
" 7	8	242	74
" 8	26	291	122
" 9	47	153	163
Totals	170	1,922	901
Grand totals	370	4,572	1,922

* Elected.

Registered voters, 10,422.

Votes cast, 6,864.

Proportion of men registered who voted 65.86 per cent.

Votes cast for Senator, State Election, 1898.

FIFTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT.

Ward 10.		INNES, * Rep.	PALMER, Dem.
Precinct 1	94	112	
" 2	176	75	
" 3	176	42	
" 4	199	40	
" 5	159	24	
" 6	241	49	
" 7	308	79	
" 8	289	81	
" 9	177	44	
Totals	1,819	546	
Ward 12.			
Precinct 1	264	69	
" 2	286	52	
" 3	169	98	
" 4	242	109	
" 5	235	79	
" 6	151	259	
" 7	109	207	
Totals	1,456	873	
Ward 18.			
Precinct 1	109	238	
" 2	128	244	
" 3	200	134	
" 4	186	245	
" 5	88	341	
" 6	157	249	
Totals	868	1,451	
Grand totals	4,143	2,870	

* Elected.

Registered voters, 11,207.

Votes cast, 7,013.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 62.58 per cent.

Votes cast for Senator, State Election, 1898.

SIXTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT.

Ward 13.	BALDWIN, * Dem.	DRYDEN, Rep.
Precinct 1.....	314	17
“ 2.....	272	23
“ 3.....	257	18
“ 4.....	274	39
“ 5.....	285	51
“ 6.....	203	47
“ 7.....	286	31
“ 8.....	253	31
Totals.....	2,144	257
Ward 14.		
Precinct 1.....	466	109
“ 2.....	422	49
“ 3.....	237	103
“ 4.....	169	173
“ 5.....	182	211
“ 6.....	168	183
“ 7.....	244	156
“ 8.....	233	162
Totals.....	2,121	1,146
Ward 15.		
Precinct 1.....	143	61
“ 2.....	299	38
“ 3.....	235	91
“ 4.....	232	107
“ 5.....	247	99
“ 6.....	155	163
“ 7.....	202	143
“ 8.....	211	125
Totals.....	1,724	827
Grand totals.....	5,989	2,230

* Elected.

Registered voters, 12,144.

Votes cast, 8,219.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 67.68 per cent.

Votes cast for Senator, State Election, 1898.

SEVENTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT.

Ward 16.		JENNINGS, Dem.	LOTT,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct	1	163	133	1
"	2	242	130	
"	3	244	205	
"	4	109	318	
"	5	146	220	
"	6	35	331	
"	7	278	199	
Totals		1,217	1,536	1
Ward 20.				
Precinct	1	172	340	
"	2	163	320	
"	3	163	258	
"	4	260	142	
"	5	198	316	
"	6	119	403	
"	7	126	375	
"	8	103	361	
Totals		1,304	2,515	
Ward 24.				
Precinct	1	169	136	
"	2	149	165	
"	3	106	287	
"	4	143	194	
"	5	93	250	
"	6	150	197	
"	7	108	315	
"	8	163	339	
"	9	122	231	
Totals		1,203	2,114	
Grand totals		3,724	6,165	1

* Elected.

Registered voters, 14,027.

Votes cast, 9,890.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 70.51 per cent.

Votes cast for Senator, State Election, 1898.

EIGHTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT.

Ward 21.	MAXWELL,* Rep.	SEAVER, Dem.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	193	90	
" 2	180	148	
" 3	137	70	
" 4	223	93	
" 5	217	123	
" 6	259	67	
" 7	235	151	
" 8	317	82	
" 9	243	117	
Totals	2,004	941	
Ward 22.			
Precinct 1	299	208	1
" 2	115	244	
" 3	64	244	
" 4	230	145	
" 5	196	162	
" 6	246	61	
" 7	281	73	
" 8	175	202	
Totals	1,606	1,339	1
Ward 23.			
Precinct 1	186	86	
" 2	74	251	
" 3	98	235	
" 4	141	196	
" 5	250	192	
" 6	302	76	
" 7	250	79	
" 8	268	65	
" 9	105	107	
Totals	1,674	1,287	
Grand totals	5,284	3,567	1

* Elected.

Registered voters, 13,023.

Votes cast, 8,852.

Proportion of men registered who voted 67.97 per cent.

Votes cast for Senator, State Election, 1898.

NINTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT.

Ward 11.		FENENO, * Dem.	LIFFLER, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct	1.....	96	218	
"	2.....	151	181	
"	3.....	148	194	
"	4.....	139	203	
"	5.....	67	191	
"	6.....	25	208	
"	7.....	29	264	
"	8.....	37	227	
"	9.....	52	226	
Totals		744	1,912	
Ward 19.				
Precinct	1.....	278	97	
"	2.....	282	89	
"	3.....	452	58	
"	4.....	302	97	
"	5.....	200	128	
"	6.....	255	134	
"	7.....	380	138	
"	8.....	344	66	
Totals		2,493	807	
Ward 25.				
Precinct	1.....	161	188	
"	2.....	81	246	
"	3.....	75	239	
"	4.....	254	56	
"	5.....	238	125	
"	6.....	162	202	
"	7.....	269	141	
Totals		1,240	1,197	
Grand totals		4,477	3,916	

* Elected.

Registered voters, 11,949.

Votes cast, 8,393.

Proportion of men registered who voted 70.24 per cent.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

FIRST DISTRICT.

Ward 1.		JOHN L. BATES,* Rep.	JAMES R. HOBDELL, Dem.	GEORGE P. PIERCE OSBORNE, Dem.	HUGH L. STALKER,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct	1	215	48	43	178	
"	2	284	24	28	268	
"	3	350	65	62	308	
"	4	302	40	31	283	
"	5	249	96	84	207	
"	6	115	198	173	81	
"	7	219	186	160	193	
"	8	206	184	151	159	2
"	9	126	35	29	97	
Totals		2,066	876	761	1,774	2

SECOND DISTRICT.

Ward 2.		GILBERT W. CAR- PENTER, Rep.	JOSEPH J. DEN- NISON, Rep.	JAMES H. DONO- VAN,* Dem.	JOHN J. DOUG- LASS,* Dem.	JAMES O'CON- NOR, Dem., Lab. Nom.
Precinct	1	59	56	238	252	49
"	2	45	45	182	181	39
"	3	78	88	223	207	34
"	4	51	52	219	235	40
"	5	55	52	178	163	17
"	6	81	80	194	179	27
"	7	39	37	265	268	37
"	8	55	57	311	267	75
Totals		463	467	1,810	1,752	318

* Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

THIRD DISTRICT.

Ward 3.		WILLIAM C. BERRY, Rep.	SAMUEL L. FILLB- BROWN, Rep.	JEREMIAH F. McCARTHY,* Dem.	JOHN I. TOLAND,* Dem.
Precinct	1.....	170	166	117	93
"	2.....	79	82	303	290
"	3.....	95	86	263	219
"	4.....	35	30	386	371
"	5.....	41	43	359	353
"	6.....	26	25	300	303
Totals.. ..		446	432	1,728	1,629

FOURTH DISTRICT.

Ward 4.		THOMAS H. GREEN,* Dem.	WILLIAM E. MAHONEY, Dem.	JEREMIAH J. McCARTHY,* Rep.	MARK E. SMITH, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct	1.....	185	144	229	70	2
"	2.....	64	52	190	157	
"	3.....	105	104	244	214	
"	4.....	221	114	262	128	
"	5.....	227	218	221	40	
"	6.....	106	94	172	99	
Totals.....		908	726	1,318	708	2

* Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

FIFTH DISTRICT.

Ward 5.		FRANK L. BLISS, Rep.	GEORGE T. HAR- LOW, Rep.	WILLIAM J. MIL- LER,* Dem.	EDMUND J. TWOMEY,* Dem.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	203	199	104	102	2
" 2	114	123	247	242	
" 3	32	32	253	256	
" 4	74	68	131	136	
" 5	74	75	290	301	
" 6	71	64	166	171	
Totals	568	561	1,191	1,208	2

SIXTH DISTRICT.

Ward 6.		DAVID ABRAMS, Rep.	WILLIAM H. ARCHER, Rep.	MICHAEL J. DONO- VAN,* Dem.	DANIEL J. KANE,* Dem.	THOMAS F. MONA- GHAN, Dem. Ind. Nom. paper.
Precinct 1	24	24	191	217	69
" 2	40	36	217	222	38
" 3	49	57	231	210	71
" 4	37	38	211	172	56
" 5	95	87	158	138	51
" 6	134	151	67	55	5
" 7	69	50	159	165	26
" 8	12	15	207	221	36
Totals	460	458	1,441	1,400	352

* Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

SEVENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 7.	JOHN W. CUNNINGHAM, Rep.	WILLIAM T. A. FITZGERALD,* Dem.	ALBERT H. HORN, Rep.	THOMAS MACKEY,* Dem.	JAMES ROB- ERTSON, Rep. Cit. Nom.
Precinct 1	97	106	93	104	24
" 2	52	118	51	115	8
" 3	66	165	63	163	37
" 4	80	73	85	66	23
" 5	22	298	23	270	10
" 6	31	258	31	258	16
Totals	348	1,018	346	976	118

EIGHTH DISTRICT.

Ward 8.	EDWARD J. DONOVAN,* Dem.	WALLACE F. FLANDERS, Rep.	MARTIN M. LOMASNEY,* Dem.	JOSEPH SPEKTORSKY, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	337	46	374	67	
" 2	267	113	255	94	
" 3	85	209	70	148	
" 4	302	119	326	129	
" 5	315	114	331	137	2
" 6	302	104	302	101	
Totals	1,608	705	1,658	676	2

* Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

NINTH DISTRICT.

Ward 9.	JOHN J. GART- LAND, Jr., Dem.	DAVID A. MAHONEY,* Dem.	JAMES W. MYRICK, Rep.	JULIUS J. SCHRIFTGESSER, Rep.
Precinct 1	228	191	89	107
" 2	253	233	96	106
" 3	357	298	21	20
" 4	267	233	92	87
" 5	143	122	159	142
" 6	100	96	143	124
" 7	310	309	59	49
Totals	1,660	1,482	659	635

TENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 10.	CHARLES S. CLERKE,* Rep.	WILLIAM C. PARKER,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	118	105	2
" 2	190	163	
" 3	193	173	
" 4	190	40	
" 5	162	145	
" 6	263	235	
" 7	341	314	
" 8	310	308	
" 9	187	173	
Totals	1,954	1,656	2

* Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

ELEVENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 11.	CHARLES J. COUNTIE, Dem.	NATHANIEL G. ROBINSON, Dem.	CHARLES R. SAUNDERS,* Rep.	GEORGE S. SELFRIE,* Rep.
Precinct 1.....	87	88	212	196
" 2.....	131	147	199	174
" 3.....	152	130	206	179
" 4.....	179	112	206	171
" 5.....	75	62	191	171
" 6.....	24	27	191	190
" 7.....	36	41	248	247
" 8.....	36	32	220	219
" 9.....	46	51	209	212
Totals.....	766	690	1,882	1,759

TWELFTH DISTRICT.

Ward 12.	JOHN B. DUMOND,* Rep.	ALFRED S. HAYES, Ind.	EDWARD P. SANDS,* Rep.
Precinct 1.....	234	117	214
" 2.....	246	122	225
" 3.....	135	140	117
" 4.....	215	146	216
" 5.....	231	94	200
" 6.....	176	207	149
" 7.....	187	177	205
Totals.....	1,424	1,003	1,326

* Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 13.	CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, Rep.	HUGH W. BRESNA- HAN,* Dem.	HERMAN BROD- BECK, Rep.	JAMES T. MAHONEY, Jr.,* Dem.	JAMES J. WHALEN, Dem., Ind., Nom. paper.
Precinct 1	15	193	11	260	97
" 2	20	169	17	167	213
" 3	15	170	12	208	142
" 4	37	173	15	229	138
" 5	37	227	34	250	90
" 6	40	175	28	192	55
" 7	20	233	13	196	119
" 8	17	223	16	171	88
Totals	201	1,563	146	1,673	942

FOURTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 14.	FRANK H. CROSS, Rep.	DAVID J. GLEA- SON, Dem.	MICHAEL JOSEPH SULLIVAN,* Dem.	JOHN J. TOOMEY,* Dem., Ind., Nom. paper, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	87	390	383	196	
" 2	22	374	409	121	
" 3	65	163	209	192	
" 4	125	112	170	207	1
" 5	156	108	182	265	
" 6	128	91	162	239	
" 7	115	167	271	204	
" 8	116	123	236	262	
Totals	814	1,528	2,022	1,686	1

* Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

FIFTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 15.		HORACE N. HATCH, Rep.	WILLIAM KELLS, Jr., * Dem.	DANIEL V. McISAAC, * Dem.	JAMES H. WAUGH, Rep.
Precinct 1	47	143	168	46
" 2	29	287	293	53
" 3	81	236	227	74
" 4	102	221	222	86
" 5	89	241	228	85
" 6	143	167	154	135
" 7	119	214	173	142
" 8	105	244	203	110
Totals	715	1,753	1,668	731

SIXTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 16.		EDWARD C. BALDWIN, Dem.	FREDERICK W. FARWELL,* Rep.	WILLIAM J. HIGGINS, Dem.	ARTHUR P. RUSSELL,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	187	136	159	111	1
" 2	187	152	165	113	
" 3	223	199	204	178	1
" 4	82	279	82	300	
" 5	90	203	87	218	
" 6	28	295	23	294	
" 7	249	172	270	196	
Totals	1,046	1,436	990	1,410	2

* Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

SEVENTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 17.		EBENEZER ADAMS, Rep.	CHARLES J. KIDNEY, Rep.	JOHN P. LANERGAN,* Dem.	JAMES H. QUEENEY,* Dem.
Precinct	1	39	73	248	205
"	2	52	73	216	213
"	3	165	174	107	107
"	4	191	204	148	145
"	5	71	99	207	189
"	6	32	56	253	215
"	7	53	127	238	198
"	8	119	182	262	260
"	9	162	204	133	130
Totals		884	1,192	1,812	1,662

EIGHTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 18.		TARENCE ADAMS, Rep.	JOSEPH C. BARRUS, Rep.	THOMAS A. CONROY,* Dem.	MICHAEL E. GADDIS,* Dem.
Precinct	1	96	98	254	205
"	2	140	132	206	183
"	3	194	193	124	116
"	4	185	183	205	203
"	5	77	77	315	349
"	6	147	163	240	248
Totals		839	846	1,344	1,304

* Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

NINETEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 19.	HERMAN BIR- KENMAIER, Rep.	THOMAS P. BUT- LER, Dem., Ind. Nom.	JOHN J. FLANA- GAN, * Dem.	OLIVER S. GRANT, * Dem.	WILLIAM H. MORGAN, Dem. Bryan Nom.	JOB H. WELLS, Rep.
Precinct 1	101	10	138	195	105	82
" 2	93	14	171	187	105	66
" 3	50	25	318	274	150	36
" 4	80	24	157	214	169	56
" 5	90	18	112	158	105	90
" 6	107	9	152	150	139	111
" 7	102	37	261	232	160	95
" 8	76	17	235	166	145	57
Totals	699	154	1,544	1,576	1,078	593

TWENTIETH DISTRICT.

Ward 20.	ARTHUR E. AUSTIN, Dem.	DANIEL J. DALY, Dem.	FRANK A. FOSTER, * Rep.	JOSEPH I. STEWART, * Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	240	191	286	224	1
" 2	202	175	279	230	
" 3	189	172	226	197	
" 4	245	245	123	114	
" 5	240	181	274	255	
" 6	146	93	279	386	
" 7	196	118	328	296	
" 8	142	91	316	302	
Totals	1,600	1,266	2,111	2,004	1

* Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

TWENTY-FIRST DISTRICT.

Ward 21.		RICHARD F. ANDREWS, JR., * Rep.	JOHN F. CURRIER, Dem.	EDWARD J. SHAUGHNESSY, Dem.	WILLIAM E. SKILLINGS,* Rep.
Precinct 1.....		194	82	76	173
“ 2.....		193	132	134	173
“ 3.....		139	64	66	127
“ 4.....		229	87	80	210
“ 5.....		226	102	109	190
“ 6.....		266	50	45	245
“ 7.....		242	137	134	200
“ 8.....		317	69	61	292
“ 9.....		266	93	81	236
Totals.....		2,072	816	786	1,846

TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT.

Ward 22.		JOHN BLEILER,* Rep.	JOSEPH E. DOWD, Dem.	RANDOLPH V. KING,* Rep.	JOHN F. SULLIVAN, Dem.	Scattering.
Precinct 1.....		305	177	274	188	1
“ 2.....		150	206	98	223	
“ 3.....		74	225	53	246	
“ 4.....		208	130	207	136	2
“ 5.....		210	129	171	151	
“ 6.....		240	48	233	52	
“ 7.....		235	81	270	64	
“ 8.....		155	194	158	198	
Totals		1,577	1,190	1,464	1,258	3

* Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

TWENTY-THIRD DISTRICT.

Ward 23.		ALBERT A. AYERS, Rep., Ind., Nom.	THOMAS F. I. CURLEY, Dem.	ORLANDO F. DE SUON, Rep.	JOHN M. MIN- TON, * Dem.	ALBERT B. ROOT, * Rep.
Precinct 1	36	83	130	143	139
" 2	13	253	57	279	61
" 3	5	276	49	288	70
" 4	4	198	114	250	123
" 5	16	185	212	259	191
" 6	18	64	246	129	259
" 7	12	62	225	106	218
" 8	11	54	246	122	233
" 9	9	110	90	127	86
Totals	124	1,285	1,369	1,703	1,380

TWENTY-FOURTH DISTRICT.

Ward 24.		MANUS J. FISH, Dem.	FRED C. GIL- PATRIC, * Rep.	QUINCY A. LOTHROP, Dem.	HARRY B. WHALL, * Rep.
Precinct 1	157	121	153	124
" 2	127	156	139	140
" 3	104	260	116	254
" 4	131	179	150	172
" 5	71	243	102	203
" 6	130	185	145	164
" 7	106	275	97	273
" 8	152	299	148	321
" 9	119	212	113	222
Totals	1,097	1,930	1,163	1,873

*Elected.

Votes cast for Representatives, State Election, 1898.

TWENTY-FIFTH DISTRICT.

Ward 25.		JAMES H. DALTON, Dem.	LEONARD W. Ross, Rep.*	GEORGE H. WENTWORTH, Dem.	WILLIAM D. WHEELER,* Rep.
Precinct 1		98	203	133	221
“ 2		61	249	55	245
“ 3		50	245	55	246
“ 4		200	68	228	52
“ 5		175	141	212	123
“ 6		115	191	157	182
“ 7		185	150	258	131
Totals		884	1,247	1,098	1,200

* Elected.

Votes cast for District Attorney, State Election, 1898.

SUFFOLK DISTRICT.

Wards.	RICHARDSON. Rep.	STEVENS.* Dem.
1	1,869	1,096
2	700	1,878
3	698	1,478
4	805	1,057
5	724	1,106
6	689	1,632
7	617	926
8	831	1,677
9	861	1,509
10	1,707	669
11	1,529	1,161
12	1,384	941
13	469	1,903
14	1,256	1,947
15	950	1,601
16	1,452	1,259
17	1,145	1,825
18	1,016	1,342
19	1,010	2,083
20	2,348	1,500
21	2,024	945
22	1,612	1,328
23	1,645	1,361
24	2,043	1,305
25	1,309	1,104
Totals	30,693	34,633

* Elected.

Registered voters 97,238.

Votes cast 65,326.

Proportion of men registered who voted 67.08 per cent.

The balance of this district is composed of Chelsea, Revere and Winthrop.

**Votes cast for Register of Probate and Insolvency, State
Election, 1898.**

SUFFOLK COUNTY.

Wards.	GEORGE.* Rep. Dem.	Scattering.
1	2,340	
2	1,926	
3	1,634	1
4	1,375	
5	1,405	
6	1,652	
7	1,132	1
8	1,923	
9	1,757	
10	1,927	
11	2,350	
12	1,913	
13	1,697	
14	2,561	
15	2,063	
16	2,255	1
17	2,347	
18	1,764	
19	2,394	
20	3,291	
21	2,583	
22	2,426	
23	2,553	
24	2,820	
25	1,966	
Totals	52,054	3

* Elected.

Registered voters, 97,238.

Votes cast, 52,057.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 53.54 per cent.

The balance of Suffolk County is composed of Chelsea, Revere and Winthrop.

Votes cast for Sheriff, State Election, 1898.
SUFFOLK COUNTY.

Wards.	GALLUPE, Citizens.	O'BRIEN, * Dem., Rep.
1	609	1,999
2	386	1,848
3	379	1,583
4	310	1,348
5	321	1,324
6	389	1,556
7	339	1,040
8	371	1,913
9	429	1,625
10	540	1,560
11	384	2,089
12	466	1,620
13	336	1,789
14	556	2,381
15	449	1,911
16	499	1,981
17	498	2,194
18	443	1,631
19	476	2,327
20	755	2,750
21	622	2,111
22	564	2,098
23	544	2,186
24	615	2,422
25	411	1,737
Totals	11,691	47,023

* Elected.

Registered voters, 97,238.

Votes cast, 58,714.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 60.38 per cent.

The balance of Suffolk County is composed of Chelsea, Revere and Winthrop.

Number of Men Registered who Voted

(AS PER WARD OFFICERS' RETURNS OF NAMES CHECKED ON VOTING LIST) AT STATE ELECTION, 1898.

Wards.	PRECINCTS.									Number of names checked.	Number registered.	Per cent. registered who voted.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.			
1....	272	327	431	362	356	360	443	427	179	3,157	4,188	75.38
2....	406	302	393	366	292	341	399	484	2,983	3,850	76.88
3....	312	411	379	459	450	367	2,378	3,075	77.33
4....	375	264	382	410	418	279	2,128	2,724	78.12
5....	333	420	325	232	415	268	1,993	2,833	70.35
6....	363	399	422	396	428	249	390	348	2,995	4,121	72.68
7....	261	228	299	227	365	367	1,747	2,492	70.10
8....	495	479	316	541	572	513	2,916	3,645	80.00
9....	378	414	411	401	333	268	415	2,620	3,713	70.56
10....	219	264	232	255	192	304	403	391	225	2,485	3,952	62.88
11....	333	378	364	361	278	243	320	278	287	2,842	3,925	72.41
12....	355	362	284	374	336	442	342	2,495	3,437	72.59
13....	390	410	369	400	390	310	371	330	2,970	3,920	75.77
14....	606	511	360	358	420	374	447	429	3,505	4,491	78.04
15....	234	375	354	363	371	341	383	379	2,800	3,733	75.01
16....	344	408	487	449	390	382	542	3,002	3,945	76.10
17....	333	321	314	391	327	335	369	481	361	3,232	4,217	76.64
18....	395	405	376	471	515	466	2,628	3,818	68.83
19....	403	401	548	426	345	417	543	460	3,543	4,482	79.05
20....	547	506	436	426	538	541	525	494	4,013	5,337	75.19
21....	300	350	220	336	352	333	400	413	368	3,072	4,418	69.53
22....	542	416	339	424	405	319	373	407	3,225	4,492	71.79
23....	285	366	376	373	480	401	347	355	228	3,211	4,113	78.07
24....	330	335	415	352	363	366	441	530	387	3,519	4,745	74.16
25....	373	344	328	328	376	384	431	2,564	3,542	72.39
Totals.....										72,023	97,238	

Average per cent. of men registered who voted, 74.07.

Votes cast for Representative, Special Election, March 1, 1898.

ELEVENTH DISTRICT.

Ward.	GEORGE S. SELFIDGE,* Rep.	HENRY D. WARREN.	Scattering.
11.....	761	85	10

*Elected.

Registered voters 4,133.

Votes cast 856.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 27.14 per cent.

Votes cast for Senator, Special Election, March 29, 1898.

Wards.	DAVID B. SHAW,* Dem.	Scattering.
3.....	931	14
4.....	500	13
5.....	481	28
Totals.....	1,912	55

* Elected.

Registered voters 8,877.

Votes cast 1,967.

Proportion of men registered who voted 22.16 per cent.

MUNICIPAL ELECTION,
1898.

[illegible]

Registered Voters (Men), Municipal Election, 1898,

Wards.	PRECINCTS.									Total.	Percent assessed polls, registered by wards.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.		
1.....	362	412	549	487	520	476	599	577	244	4,226	66.96
2.....	524	432	499	450	377	482	543	624	3,931	60.51
3.....	441	555	476	608	580	450	3,110	72.29
4.....	486	371	484	506	521	376	2,744	67.45
5.....	455	559	494	363	557	441	2,869	64.05
6.....	479	518	604	626	626	331	529	461	4,174	46.55
7.....	371	351	438	367	498	505	2,530	48.67
8.....	561	640	455	684	673	680	3,693	46.89
9.....	580	642	537	580	503	384	549	3,775	45.50
10.....	412	414	352	412	343	447	640	618	392	4,030	54.79
11.....	453	525	525	520	400	323	442	369	397	3,954	62.99
12.....	518	489	394	524	489	604	465	3,483	55.93
13.....	513	552	497	519	512	429	493	471	3,986	52.28
14.....	777	657	461	451	537	491	587	554	4,515	72.71
15.....	332	529	506	460	474	451	508	497	3,757	69.23
16.....	472	586	656	593	506	473	682	3,968	72.08
17.....	469	450	413	528	426	443	473	641	445	4,288	61.69
18.....	548	624	584	735	694	700	3,885	53.64
19.....	530	524	672	546	456	548	686	566	4,528	63.75
20.....	711	674	575	586	783	673	709	674	5,385	71.00
21.....	474	511	338	483	511	462	596	587	534	4,496	71.07
22.....	773	589	485	622	589	445	510	566	4,579	65.60
23.....	341	457	475	481	668	555	419	455	301	4,152	70.65
24.....	472	442	613	474	452	460	622	754	518	4,807	68.65
25.....	573	507	450	484	504	527	547	3,592	65.56
Total										98,457	

Average per cent. of men assessed who registered, 61.09.

**Votes cast for Board of Estimate and Apportionment, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Wards.	FOR TWO YEARS.			FOR ONE YEAR.		
	PETER MOR- RISON, Rep.	JOHN H. SULLIVAN, * Dem.	Scattering.	LAURENCE MINOT,* Dem.	THOMAS RUSSELL, Rep.	Scattering.
1	1,666	1,272		1,146	1,594	
2	597	2,025		1,860	528	
3	635	1,450		1,460	550	
4	671	1,010		1,015	655	
5	617	1,126		1,151	565	1
6	680	1,688		1,696	566	
7	447	990		958	395	
8	1,275	1,029		1,129	1,124	
9	734	1,535		1,561	654	
10	1,389	603		775	1,236	
11	1,388	1,029	1	1,288	1,167	
12	1,187	910		1,010	1,073	
13	333	2,013		1,959	310	
14	1,055	1,894		1,943	969	
15	839	1,462		1,507	782	
16	1,232	1,214		1,299	1,135	
17	953	1,765		1,805	907	
18	837	1,397		1,446	810	
19	828	2,072		2,056	748	
20	1,976	1,445		1,631	1,805	
21	1,825	1,013		1,238	1,593	
22	1,522	1,418		1,496	1,392	
23	1,513	1,363	1	1,522	1,384	
24	1,753	1,244		1,348	1,631	
25	1,224	1,102		1,214	1,104	
Totals	27,181	34,069	2	35,513	24,686	1

* Elected.

Votes cast for Street Commissioner, Municipal Election, 1898.

Wards.	SALEM D. CHARLES,* Dem.	GEORGE H. INNIS, Rep.	STEPHEN SHAUGH- NESSY, Soc. Lab.	Scattering.
1.....	1,074	1,760	69	
2.....	1,846	569	93	
3.....	1,408	620	82	
4.....	955	700	71	
5.....	1,024	688	67	
6.....	1,611	619	123	
7.....	900	478	92	
8.....	1,115	1,062	174	
9.....	1,465	699	157	
10.....	568	1,433	59	
11.....	647	1,758	44	
12.....	841	1,209	79	
13.....	1,716	521	172	
14.....	1,583	1,310	138	
15.....	1,126	1,121	128	
16.....	1,072	1,329	117	
17.....	1,735	938	146	
18.....	1,400	815	167	
19.....	1,980	800	210	
20.....	1,308	2,113	89	1
21.....	877	1,973	79	
22.....	1,529	1,417	145	
23.....	1,473	1,391	127	
24.....	1,157	1,853	85	
25.....	1,095	1,254	65	
Totals	31,505	28,430	2,778	1

* Elected.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 63.70 per cent.

Votes cast for Aldermen, Municipal Election, 1898.

Wards.	WILBUR F. ADAMS * (Republican).	CHARLES I. ALBEE (Republican).	HERBERT R. AVERILL (Rep., Ind. Nom.).	JOSEPH BALLAM (Socialist Labor).	DAVID F. BARRY * (Democratic).	GODFREY BECK (Socialist Labor).	WILLIAM BERWIN * (Republican).	AUSTIN BIGELOW (Rep., Ind., Nom.	SEWALL C. BRACKETT (Democratic).
1.....	1,165	1,607	78	42	684	46	1,132	215	485
2.....	367	540	30	69	1,147	61	361	83	697
3.....	337	311	37	43	767	69	310	140	518
4.....	480	383	44	56	593	51	412	149	414
5.....	401	316	47	38	673	42	375	133	409
6.....	290	264	61	62	1,050	59	595	86	465
7.....	242	174	10	34	537	48	277	48	290
8.....	511	400	53	113	690	104	1,017	126	392
9.....	449	330	48	95	1,414	122	519	93	600
10.....	909	666	102	45	437	41	904	267	247
11.....	1,099	778	115	29	587	33	1,036	485	453
12.....	772	580	72	51	575	61	836	206	351
13.....	138	155	28	81	816	76	157	60	587
14.....	678	489	45	76	900	77	631	192	541
15.....	513	338	27	70	770	99	477	138	563
16.....	987	535	56	84	672	102	803	197	524
17.....	610	477	85	72	960	77	576	207	666
18.....	504	355	71	80	662	76	495	155	447
19.....	467	307	54	131	1,122	132	438	165	952
20.....	1,845	1,005	96	62	882	70	1,301	433	548
21.....	1,365	905	174	59	671	78	1,244	390	509
22.....	978	673	94	126	719	119	905	264	1,276
23.....	1,067	771	75	106	890	104	973	264	1,625
24.....	1,425	816	81	67	755	91	1,105	335	528
25.....	767	545	81	43	704	46	523	1,518	467
Totals...	18,366	13,720	1,664	1,734	19,677	1,884	17,402	6,349	14,554

* Elected.

Votes cast for Aldermen, Municipal Election, 1898.

MANASSAH E. BRAD- LEY (Dem. Ctt., Nom.),	MICHAEL W. BRICK * (Democratic).	GEORGE S. BROOKS (Republican).	CHARLES H. BRYANT (Rep., Ind., Nom.).	DANIEL C. CASEY (Dem., Ctt., Nom.).	FRANKLIN L. CODMAN * (Republican).	JOHN H. COLBY * (Republican).	GEORGE URIEL CROCKER (Republican).	FREDERICK W. DAY * (Democratic).	Wards.
147	638	874	82	87	1,122	980	777	1,711 1
544	1,100	256	41	124	330	279	257	1,737 2
118	726	237	58	179	325	286	281	662 3
109	600	311	53	110	428	350	315	506 4
96	605	255	70	129	364	343	277	507 5
201	1,118	198	46	228	297	316	253	938 6
55	482	163	41	90	260	238	222	286 7
126	864	269	65	822	506	489	344	455 8
103	1,067	351	75	173	423	445	351	721 9
44	293	1,034	121	50	1,035	1,011	1,042	229 10
34	385	858	145	65	1,300	1,359	1,790	266 11
39	433	599	137	134	806	1,143	777	328 12
107	691	86	42	391	153	116	87	628 13
59	661	391	142	189	683	548	456	620 14
66	586	286	58	245	511	476	352	559 15
51	564	455	101	283	939	731	676	489 16
80	726	393	256	1,078	584	548	478	689 17
71	540	349	496	409	455	408	332	408 18
115	850	263	298	416	442	389	375	778 19
72	579	842	214	205	1,800	1,361	1,226	534 20
62	420	857	253	255	1,299	1,217	1,234	379 21
63	556	629	260	314	1,060	935	877	503 22
37	649	706	202	115	1,142	980	915	590 23
47	541	924	149	157	1,709	1,207	1,058	528 24
41	547	500	137	73	761	723	660	458 25
2,577	16,221	12,086	3,542	6,321	18,734	16,878	15,412	15,509	Totals.

* Elected.

Votes cast for Aldermen, Municipal Election, 1898.

Wards.	EDWARD W. DIXON * (Democratic).	JAMES H. DOYLE * (Democratic).	WILLIAM R. DYER (Socialist Labor).	SAMUEL I. FREEDMAN (Socialist Labor).	GEORGE GIGUIRE (Socialist Labor).	LEON GREENMAN (Socialist Labor).	HENRY C. HESS (Socialist Labor).	FRANCIS J. HORGAN (Dem., Cit., Nom.).	CHARLES M. LANGEN (Socialist Labor).
1.....	651	407	61	41	31	24	19	108	16
2.....	1,179	736	59	55	38	31	35	177	18
3.....	671	557	54	26	21	18	22	281	24
4.....	517	442	51	30	26	24	24	146	14
5.....	670	605	38	29	26	19	16	246	9
6.....	1,712	647	72	68	40	36	40	328	23
7.....	392	527	52	50	33	31	30	175	40
8.....	610	1,096	118	131	86	100	81	1,276	41
9.....	621	1,100	118	91	82	75	73	183	33
10.....	259	291	48	37	24	33	32	93	27
11.....	299	263	34	24	20	17	15	134	7
12.....	378	897	52	50	34	33	29	147	22
13.....	693	945	80	46	45	34	31	574	25
14.....	803	748	96	62	52	48	42	289	25
15.....	610	693	76	62	44	37	33	347	21
16.....	461	674	90	56	59	48	47	225	26
17.....	767	1,223	81	49	41	35	49	295	23
18.....	516	926	99	78	65	63	84	190	35
19.....	807	1,485	127	110	76	84	180	394	45
20.....	568	553	63	47	32	32	34	208	31
21.....	370	473	54	48	31	34	34	156	22
22.....	591	783	131	140	92	131	121	265	47
23.....	479	682	108	127	80	81	76	108	34
24.....	563	537	68	41	35	37	33	113	23
25.....	513	672	58	28	27	22	28	114	14
Totals...	15,700	17,962	1,888	1,526	1,140	1,127	1,208	6,572	645

* Elected.

Votes cast for Aldermen, Municipal Election, 1898.

ALBERT W. LYON (Republican).	JOHN J. MAHONEY (Democrat).	PATRICK F. McDON- ALD * (Democrat).	JOSEPH MURPHY (Socialist Labor).	ALFRED NEWMARCH (Republican).	MICHAEL W. NORRIS (Democrat).	JOSEPH J. NORTON (Democrat).	FRANK J. O'TOOLE * (Democrat).	MILTON C. PAIGE (Republican).	Wards.
262	396	414	28	565	431	316	427	651 1
100	801	688	54	181	751	664	846	200 2
113	1,316	580	48	199	470	376	614	248 3
126	816	394	45	216	330	251	454	330 4
120	878	462	32	248	384	360	533	273 5
97	761	505	36	150	826	631	824	185 6
85	415	536	48	152	461	332	410	241 7
108	1,033	921	65	313	362	269	397	285 8
144	655	635	46	222	657	482	743	342 9
364	199	220	21	363	170	142	214	71410
309	185	193	10	450	197	166	209	65111
263	331	376	93	386	331	255	402	56412
68	751	956	69	79	1,770	1,171	823	60613
182	693	794	67	375	1,181	1,731	771	1,38714
150	612	778	49	239	953	1,041	562	1,07115
837	445	744	41	431	538	551	520	81716
199	600	815	59	412	644	572	1,030	43817
130	417	521	95	338	504	464	1,412	37118
132	769	873	91	404	827	600	1,394	36319
716	450	1,340	49	841	508	520	576	1,17420
394	334	420	39	1,443	348	257	489	89821
286	486	675	71	812	560	393	858	73622
262	477	737	39	927	556	391	718	78423
602	452	921	37	676	505	450	558	1,04824
194	468	438	56	403	383	454	561	44225
6,243	14,740	15,936	1,288	10,825	14,647	12,839	16,345	14,819	Totals.

* Elected.

Votes cast for Aldermen, Municipal Election, 1898.

Wards.	EDWARD W. PRESHO* (Republican).	JOHN QUINN, JR. (Democratic).	HERMAN W. A. RAASCH (Socialist Labor).	JAY ROBERT SIMMONS (Socialist Labor).	FLORENTIN THIE- BAULT (Soc. Labor).	ERNEST C. WAGNER (Republican).	Scattering.
1.....	919	554	10	15	14	262	
2.....	405	1,274	24	17	19	77	
3.....	851	659	9	14	15	93	1
4.....	777	477	10	16	16	131	2
5.....	888	438	10	15	14	113	
6.....	455	639	37	27	37	109	4
7.....	330	923	15	15	15	334	2
8.....	449	342	44	44	45	122	1
9.....	414	850	29	33	28	189	1
10.....	861	288	18	21	17	417	
11.....	989	569	5	15	12	253	
12.....	644	378	31	23	42	236	
13.....	351	960	17	41	35	69	
14.....	763	860	39	48	68	225	2
15.....	629	713	19	34	46	199	7
16.....	756	531	21	42	26	244	4
17.....	566	734	34	32	23	151	8
18.....	424	487	30	35	36	181	8
19.....	503	657	40	47	42	376	142
20.....	1,196	536	34	22	25	301	1
21.....	1,151	355	14	17	8	341	2
22.....	1,036	462	56	41	67	561	48
23.....	955	499	27	35	30	356	
24.....	1,051	483	22	27	18	306	
25.....	696	343	20	15	11	207	
Totals.....	18,059	15,011	615	691	709	5,853	233

*Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 1.	A. DUDLEY BAGLEY,* Rep.	GEORGE H. BATTIS,* Rep.	JOHN A. BRANT, Dem.	JOHN D. MURPHY, Dem.	JAMES J. O'ROURKE, Dem.	DAVID W. SIMPSON,* Rep.
Precinct 1.....	199	190	60	49	52	192
" 2.....	255	253	34	24	22	247
" 3.....	307	304	68	61	51	322
" 4.....	293	285	46	43	37	289
" 5.....	207	190	118	96	105	197
" 6.....	92	69	222	197	204	79
" 7.....	227	195	167	161	170	204
" 8.....	254	159	195	163	174	162
" 9.....	111	119	41	40	39	109
Totals	1,945	1,764	951	834	854	1,801

Ward 2.	ROBERT GOOD- MAN, Rep.	JOSEPH F. HICKEY,* Dem.	FRANK J. JOHNSON,* Dem.	PAUL K. OLUF- SON, Rep.	THOMAS F. RICE,* Dem.	LEWIS W. WOLF- SON, Rep.
Precinct 1.....	56	272	264	45	270	43
" 2.....	57	194	191	39	190	39
" 3.....	77	245	249	72	240	68
" 4.....	50	227	228	41	235	40
" 5.....	47	213	187	36	179	32
" 6.....	76	238	218	74	212	70
" 7.....	43	317	295	37	295	28
" 8.....	70	325	321	51	308	57
Totals	476	2,031	1,953	395	1,929	377

* Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 3.	HENRY B. CAR- ROLL,* Dem.	FREDERICK A. CHURCHILL, Rep.	PERCY A. DODGE, Rep.	FRANCIS J. DOHERTY,* Dem.	CHARLES A. HARRIGAN,* Dem.	WALTER L. WOOD, Rep.
Precinct 1.....	84	185	181	87	81	179
" 2.....	268	93	85	258	244	89
" 3.....	206	114	117	259	190	117
" 4.....	354	33	37	320	318	39
" 5.....	332	57	54	318	315	54
" 6.....	289	23	29	271	261	24
Totals.....	1,533	505	503	1,513.	1,409	502

Ward 4.	GEORGE A. GAR- LAND, Rep.	THOMAS A. KELLEY,* Dem.	FRED M. KIMBALL, Rep.	JOHN P. SULLIVAN,* Dem.	HENRY B. TAYLOR, Rep.	JOSEPH A. TURN- BULL,* Dem.
Precinct 1.....	77	253	72	221	67	218
" 2.....	148	66	136	68	136	75
" 3.....	182	127	175	122	177	125
" 4.....	105	205	111	199	136	192
" 5.....	48	286	50	302	62	273
" 6.....	92	125	107	123	90	111
Totals.....	652	1,062	651	1,035	668	994

* Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 5.	WILLIAM E. BEN- NETT,* Dem.	NATHANIEL E. CUSHING, Rep.	JOHN F. GIB- BONS,* Dem.	EDWARD H. MAD- DEN,* Dem.	H. SEWARD ME- LENEY, Rep.	WILLIAM A. SAR- GENT, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1...	123	174	104	111	182	168	1
" 2...	249	114	243	248	101	109	
" 3...	274	31	267	268	32	31	
" 4...	132	72	134	131	64	68	
" 5...	249	82	261	252	73	79	
" 6...	195	71	204	158	70	70	
Totals	1,222	544	1,213	1,168	522	525	1

Ward 6.	ANDREW A. BADA- RACCO,* Dem.	JOSEPH BARRON, Rep.	PATRICK H. BRADLEY,* Dem.	FREDERICK L. CORCORAN, Dem., Cit. Nom. Rep.	TIMOTHY F. DACEY, Dem., Ind. Nom.	CHARLES J. DOUGLAS, Dem., Cit. Nom.	WILLIAM J. O'BRIEN,* Dem.	HARWOOD S. PALMER, Rep.	SAMUEL T. SULLIVAN, Dem., Bryan, Nom.
Precinct 1.....	149	25	184	141	21	4	250	13	30
" 2.....	190	34	235	134	25	11	228	21	17
" 3.....	210	43	186	168	11	18	205	25	19
" 4.....	193	26	181	95	12	12	231	14	58
" 5.....	193	102	148	138	9	18	150	72	20
" 6.....	35	135	45	108	9	8	48	142	6
" 7.....	128	86	161	170	11	7	152	45	17
" 8.....	187	12	271	105	9	6	243	7	12
Totals	1,285	463	1,411	1,059	107	84	1,507	339	179

* Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 7.	JOHN L. DONOVAN,* Dem.	JAMES H. NORRIS, Rep.	CZESLAW V. SKOKOWSKI, Rep.	JAMES H. STONE,* Dem.	JAMES A. SWEENEY,* Dem.	FRANK P. VOLL, Rep.
Precinct 1.....	117	97	78	124	114	70
" 2.....	126	62	49	117	141	71
" 3.....	140	84	68	141	131	80
" 4.....	58	91	65	63	61	84
" 5.....	273	35	22	262	258	27
" 6.....	282	31	21	251	223	28
Totals	996	400	303	958	928	360

Ward 8.	WILLIAM H. CUDDY,* Dem.	JOHN L. DERBY, Rep., Cit. Nom.	JACOB EPSTEIN, Soc. Labor.	ERNEST F. FLANDERS, Rep.	ARTHUR B. GLOVER, Rep., Cit. Nom.	DANIEL J. KILEY,* Dem.	MARTIN LEFTOVITH,* Dem.	WILLIAM D. LEROY, Rep.	ISAAC LEVIN, Dem., Soc. Nom.	EDWARD L. ROSEMAN, Soc. Labor.	JAMES F. STEVENS, Soc. Labor.	FRANK WASSERMAN, Rep.
Precinct 1.....	306	10	32	33	9	317	313	22	22	21	29	36
" 2.....	231	25	31	95	26	217	200	83	13	24	40	65
" 3.....	61	54	6	167	47	48	39	157	3	6	10	115
" 4.....	272	23	29	86	23	267	285	71	35	26	25	62
" 5.....	285	20	61	66	10	283	327	51	39	45	41	87
" 6.....	323	29	23	66	21	289	279	55	18	17	30	56
Totals	1,478	161	182	513	136	1,421	1,443	439	130	139	175	421

* Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 9.		JORGEN ANDERSON, Soc. Labor.	COLON A. BATSON, Rep.	FRANK H. COWIN, Dem., Ind. Nom., Rep.	JOHN GRISHAVER, Soc. Labor.	SAMUEL W. HOUSTON, Rep.	SAMUEL KASANOF,* Dem.	MICHAEL LEONARD,* Dem.	STEPHEN O'SHAUGHNESSY, Soc. Labor.	JOHN J. TOBIN,* Dem.
Precinct 1		32	76	93	24	72	197	184	31	201
" 2		27	85	113	25	87	185	199	32	240
" 3		16	15	101	10	13	219	267	28	267
" 4		29	70	128	20	66	190	216	32	207
" 5		15	151	165	25	150	102	113	14	126
" 6		23	131	124	16	132	72	88	20	90
" 7		18	47	123	10	42	198	291	22	252
Totals		160	575	847	130	562	1,163	1,358	179	1,383

Ward 10.		CHARLES A. ATKINS, Rep., Ind. Nom.	JOHN BORD- MAN, JR.,* Rep.	JAMES CONNER, Dem.	THOMAS J. DEVLIN, Dem.	WALTER R. MANSFIELD,* Rep.	GEORGE H. MOORE,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1		45	66	82	91	71	83	1
" 2		74	123	70	63	127	139	
" 3		60	157	31	31	161	156	
" 4		60	139	32	33	140	138	
" 5		36	104	15	17	97	97	
" 6		76	189	29	32	184	166	
" 7		119	242	39	43	225	215	
" 8		176	200	59	56	219	174	
" 9		74	126	31	35	139	116	
Totals ...		720	1,346	388	401	1,363	1,284	1

* Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 11.	EDWARD A. ARMISTEAD,* Rep.	WILLIAM A. L. BAZELEY, Dem.	CHARLES H. BOWIE, Dem.	WILLIAM S. MITCHELL, Dem.	WILLIAM S. B. STEVENS,* Rep.	LAWRENCE M. STOCKTON,* Rep.
Precinct 1	217	66	64	69	229	227
“ 2	183	51	101	116	160	157
“ 3	168	123	120	135	187	177
“ 4	158	130	86	87	208	222
“ 5	168	68	30	24	209	231
“ 6	159	41	18	20	184	192
“ 7	215	50	26	23	239	253
“ 8	163	64	23	11	206	232
“ 9	178	35	22	17	195	200
Totals	1,609	628	490	502	1,817	1,891

Ward 12.	DAVID B. CHAM- BERLAIN,* Rep.	TIMOTHY M. CLIFFORD, Dem.	DONALD N. MACDONALD,* Rep.	J. FRANK MCBARRON, Dem.	PATRICK C. O'DONNELL, Dem.	ARTHUR K. PECK,* Rep.
Precinct 1	249	52	261	56	48	252
“ 2	243	48	238	42	34	244
“ 3	134	91	131	92	89	134
“ 4	215	100	203	103	88	204
“ 5	182	70	174	64	62	180
“ 6	139	232	132	232	224	138
“ 7	92	199	118	169	189	105
Totals	1,254	792	1,257	758	734	1,257

* Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 13.		THOMAS J. * COLLINS, Dem.	MORGAN * J. KING, Rep.	FRANK J. * LANEHAN, Dem.	MICHAEL J. LYDON, * Dem.	GEORGE E. ROULSTON, Rep.	GEORGE F. WALTON, Rep.
Precinct	1	259	20	229	253	22	6
"	2	270	51	268	279	33	15
"	3	225	38	221	256	18	12
"	4	259	32	270	281	26	23
"	5	259	45	247	249	40	30
"	6	201	46	189	199	43	41
"	7	242	34	234	207	74	18
"	8	227	26	228	218	31	14
Totals		1,942	292	1,886	1,942	287	159

Ward 14.		JOHN MCK. CAMERON, Rep.	GEORGE A. * DONAHOE, Dem.	HERMAN HORMEL, Rep.	EDWARD L. LOGAN, * Dem.	JAMES F. MULCAHY, * Dem.
Precinct	1	106	366	119	396	360
"	2	24	354	56	366	366
"	3	95	204	107	242	220
"	4	142	156	154	191	173
"	5	182	159	195	199	161
"	6	154	141	182	187	159
"	7	115	199	152	241	222
"	8	133	209	147	240	234
Totals		951	1,788	1,112	2,062	1,895

* Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 15.		AMOS CUMMINGS, Rep.	JOHN D. FENTON,* Dem.	JOSEPH P. FOLEY, Soc. Labor.	DAVID A. GAVAGAN, Rep.	JOHN H. GIBLIN,* Dem.	JOHN LE FORT, Soc. Labor.	WILLIAM MARTIN,* Dem.	NICKOLAS OSTER, Soc. Labor.	HERBERT RILEY, Rep.
Precinct 1.....		42	147	8	48	120	5	123	8	39
" 2.....		27	250	26	44	254	15	240	13	23
" 3.....		68	211	20	97	196	13	207	11	58
" 4.....		87	180	10	120	190	3	174	2	77
" 5.....		80	197	25	87	232	13	200	9	70
" 6.....		129	131	35	124	149	17	145	18	119
" 7.....		86	144	66	92	142	27	162	26	88
" 8.....		96	184	54	89	174	27	190	21	104
Totals		615	1,444	244	701	1,457	120	1,441	108	578

Ward 16.		FRANK S. ATWOOD,* Rep.	EDWIN D. BAKER, Dem.	LAWRENCE J. EARLE, Dem.	CHARLES E. EDDY,* Rep.	MICHAEL I. TULLY, Dem.	FRANK E. WELLS,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1...		115	117	165	106	111	101	
" 2...		98	188	220	93	182	97	2
" 3...		159	221	239	165	221	164	
" 4...		258	131	111	263	90	247	
" 5...		198	132	123	195	117	191	
" 6...		271	76	38	253	23	253	2
" 7...		170	244	236	160	301	160	
Totals		1,269	1,109	1,132	1,235	1,045	1,213	4

* Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 17.	PATRICK H. BRENNAN,* Dem.	TIMOTHY L. CONNOLLY,* Dem.	GEORGE A. FLYNN,* Dem.	GEORGE A. LORD, Rep.	DAVID D. PILLER, Rep.	WALTER A. WOODS, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1...	224	243	223	37	39	39	1
" 2...	228	232	232	61	56	55	
" 3...	116	117	110	154	147	158	
" 4...	148	148	153	176	174	174	
" 5...	204	183	210	64	69	62	
" 6...	239	220	251	34	43	40	
" 7...	248	225	258	55	56	48	
" 8...	283	250	284	114	101	117	
" 9...	145	139	160	159	148	145	
Totals	1,835	1,757	1,881	854	833	838	1

Ward 18.	DANIEL N. S. BARKER, Rep.	JAMES J. CASEY,* Dem.	JOHN J. CURLEY,* Dem.	ISAAC L. VERVEER, Rep.	JOSEPH E. WAGNER, Rep.	JAMES A. WATSON,* Dem.
Precinct 1.....	68	255	232	91	81	229
" 2.....	113	187	187	113	123	204
" 3.....	149	117	106	157	173	117
" 4.....	162	227	217	195	174	227
" 5.....	67	305	322	59	62	362
" 6.....	142	254	248	132	143	279
Totals	701	1,345	1,312	747	756	1,418

* Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 19.	WILLIAM H. DOYLE,* Dem.	FRANK J. KELTER, Rep.	JAMES MCINERNEY,* Dem.	CHARLES P. NANGLE,* Dem.	WILLIAM H. TOBIN, Rep.	JAMES F. VILA, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1...	196	107	204	175	132	86	
" 2...	199	106	172	163	131	80	
" 3...	281	141	332	249	142	35	
" 4...	218	120	250	200	158	63	
" 5...	154	112	150	144	145	101	
" 6...	208	143	202	181	157	108	
" 7...	260	212	288	205	173	87	
" 8...	261	90	245	229	117	57	1
Totals	1,777	1,031	1,843	1,546	1,155	617	1

Ward 20.	FRANK P. BALL, Rep. Ind. Nom., Dem.	LOUIS P. HOWARD,* Rep.	FRANK D. HOWE, Rep. Ind. Nom., Dem.	JOHN R. MCVEY, Dem.	GEORGE R. MILLER,* Rep.	GEORGE O. WOOD,* Rep.
Precinct 1.....	194	302	170	171	247	259
" 2.....	186	260	169	165	260	250
" 3.....	154	185	162	181	186	181
" 4.....	226	117	226	256	108	118
" 5.....	230	212	256	186	243	220
" 6.....	177	292	153	102	281	298
" 7.....	146	285	159	111	302	314
" 8.....	121	261	139	85	286	291
Totals.....	1,434	1,914	1,434	1,257	1,913	1,931

* Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 21.	MARTIN P. F. CURLEY, Dem.	HERBERT E. EDMONDS, Dem.	FRED A. EMERY,* Rep.	FREDERICK W. KLEMM,* Rep.	MATTHEW M. MORRIS, Dem.	TEMPLE A. WINSLOE,* Rep.
Precinct 1.....	107	92	202	194	93	189
" 2.....	160	119	190	186	119	163
" 3.....	92	68	140	137	66	121
" 4.....	100	70	232	217	80	214
" 5.....	119	103	208	205	121	204
" 6.....	57	45	254	242	49	242
" 7.....	147	142	218	210	140	210
" 8.....	75	67	292	281	63	275
" 9.....	102	95	243	229	93	220
Totals.....	959	801	1,979	1,901	824	1,838

Ward 22.	JOHN M. BRAUNEIS, Dem.	CHARLES J. GRACE, Dem.	ABRAM JORDAN,* Rep.	GEORGE W. LOREY,* Rep.	WILLIAM G. ROEMER,* Rep.	CHARLES F. SEFTON, Dem.	Scattering.
Precinct 1..	209	174	281	302	319	171	
" 2..	263	225	100	124	117	232	1
" 3..	227	244	53	57	50	266	
" 4..	115	134	227	225	257	119	
" 5..	156	122	174	196	215	122	
" 6..	59	47	229	236	238	46	
" 7..	71	75	255	253	252	74	
" 8..	177	181	163	173	185	175	1
Totals	1,277	1,202	1,482	1,566	1,633	1,205	2

*Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 23.		ANDREW BRAUER,* Rep.	JOHN H. BRODERICK,* Dem.	FRANCIS J. V. DAKIN, Dem.	CHARLES W. DENNIS, Rep.	GUY F. NEWHALL,* Dem.	FRANK R. PUMPHREY, Rep.	ROBERT J. STRONGE, Rep. Ind. Nom.	Scattering.
Precinct	1	145	108	92	142	96	155	40	
"	2	64	297	227	85	251	62	19	
"	3	73	273	235	61	254	72	21	1
"	4	119	199	187	115	199	102	42	
"	5	212	175	228	175	179	159	118	
"	6	241	73	94	178	115	179	170	1
"	7	189	48	81	169	95	142	133	
"	8	202	43	54	247	109	201	91	
"	9	81	104	98	85	134	67	20	
Totals		1,326	1,320	1,296	1,257	1,432	1,139	654	2

Ward 24.		JOHN DEVINE, Dem.	EDMUND J. HARDY, Dem.	WILLIAM E. HARVEY,* Rep.	WILLARD W. HIBBARD,* Rep.	THOMAS H. MEADE, Dem.	SAMUEL H. MILDRAM,* Rep.
Precinct	1	175	169	102	116	180	107
"	2	119	131	150	155	117	169
"	3	105	111	240	245	118	244
"	4	121	137	159	167	140	172
"	5	66	66	200	222	79	208
"	6	128	129	164	179	134	171
"	7	104	95	273	266	97	274
"	8	150	132	318	320	137	302
"	9	110	114	182	202	111	181
Totals		1,078	1,084	1,788	1,872	1,113	1,828

* Elected.

**Votes cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal
Election, 1898.**

Ward 25.	MARTIN F. DEVINE, Dem.	WILLIAM A. KELLEY, Dem.	THOMAS M. RODDY, Dem.	EZRA N. ROLLAND,* Rep.	CLARENCE W. SANDERSON,* Rep.	HARVEY W. WALKER,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	114	139	112	198	220	215	1
“ 2	47	47	45	271	270	277	
“ 3	38	42	39	252	249	250	
“ 4	222	235	220	66	87	71	
“ 5	200	194	173	126	172	131	
“ 6	126	119	105	203	230	212	
“ 7	222	223	209	138	149	140	
Totals.	969	999	903	1,254	1,377	1,296	1

* Elected.

Votes cast (Men and Women) for School Committee (Three Years), Municipal Election, 1898.

Wards.	WILLARD S. ALLEN, Com. 100, I. W., Rep.	FANNY B. AMES, Com. 100, I. W., P. S. Ass'n.	MARTHA MOORE AVERY, Soc. Labor.	DANA P. BARTLETT, P. S. Ass'n.	I. AUSTIN BAS- SETT, Com. 100, I. W., P. S. Ass'n.	THOMAS W. BERRIDGE, Dem.	EDMUND BILINGS, P. S. Ass'n.	JOHN A. BRETT,* Dem.
1.....	1,857	1,270	275	477	992	998	393	996
2.....	663	419	347	250	326	1,716	195	1,672
3.....	620	502	301	244	412	1,464	177	1,282
4.....	747	494	258	237	413	931	177	906
5.....	650	479	246	236	367	1,098	249	1,039
6.....	472	360	338	252	283	1,546	225	1,475
7.....	434	372	288	207	246	827	241	852
8.....	697	535	433	346	429	1,243	290	1,216
9.....	692	557	437	327	419	1,325	372	1,336
10.....	1,329	1,264	217	746	1,056	398	694	417
11.....	1,301	1,938	159	1,416	1,732	401	1,363	384
12.....	1,201	1,182	249	611	939	732	586	771
13.....	235	216	603	176	130	1,721	220	1,705
14.....	1,128	934	541	437	774	1,690	544	1,697
15.....	877	735	454	357	613	1,293	446	1,335
16.....	1,226	947	330	555	804	1,057	542	1,068
17.....	866	706	396	452	561	1,656	437	1,687
18.....	772	614	380	299	494	1,140	376	1,120
19.....	771	515	497	399	474	1,711	467	1,749
20.....	1,920	1,786	305	981	1,679	1,131	1,020	1,196
21.....	1,834	1,811	236	1,031	1,515	761	980	832
22.....	1,408	1,182	412	700	991	1,140	743	1,185
23.....	1,463	1,420	386	740	1,177	1,083	842	1,115
24.....	1,760	1,517	314	729	1,392	1,069	657	1,119
25.....	1,161	1,160	228	696	979	1,036	597	1,118
Totals.....	26,084	22,915	8,630	12,901	19,197	29,167	12,833	272

* Elected.

Votes cast (Men and Women) for School Committee (Three Years), Municipal Election, 1898.

FRANCIS A. CAMPBELL,* Dem.	CHARLES T. DUKELOW, Dem., Rep.	SAMUEL F. HUBBARD, Com. 100, I. W., P. S. Ass'n.	JOHN W. JOHNSON, Rep.	ELIZABETH C. KELLER,* Com. 100, I. W., Dem., Rep.	THOMAS J. KENNY,* Dem.	A. LAWRENCE LOWELL, Com. 100, I. W., P. S. Ass'n.	IGNATIUS S. MCDONOUGH,* Dem.	Wards.
956	1,141	915	1,058	1,599	960	891	922 1
1,631	894	316	352	846	1,661	297	1,612 2
1,239	657	415	298	738	1,300	336	1,245 3
884	551	404	394	704	884	396	872 4
959	591	366	313	663	996	375	1,016 5
1,456	875	319	307	836	1,474	255	1,439 6
799	450	247	266	509	881	293	842 7
1,194	808	447	407	754	1,330	414	1,162 8
1,332	686	417	464	804	1,293	420	1,287 9
391	632	1,054	680	1,175	426	1,082	38210
368	567	1,813	492	1,119	383	1,840	36111
761	699	893	923	1,109	742	908	78012
1,897	780	122	178	467	1,859	117	1,75113
1,666	1,016	787	533	1,135	1,781	742	1,68914
1,361	834	615	388	869	1,490	561	1,33215
1,079	926	794	686	1,162	1,099	878	1,06216
1,640	970	550	513	1,018	1,654	593	1,71617
1,136	683	442	482	846	1,157	430	1,35518
1,751	924	490	430	903	1,786	443	1,83219
1,168	1,300	1,493	896	1,784	1,190	1,467	1,15520
762	1,021	1,547	887	1,678	776	1,551	78521
1,130	1,017	980	757	1,704	1,148	995	1,13722
1 106	939	1,166	668	1,591	1,099	1,164	1,09323
1 3	1,131	1,258	879	1,709	1,068	1,253	1,01024
	835	925	535	1,218	1,050	953	99325
20,927	18,775	13,786	26,945	29,487	18,654	28,830 Totals	

* Elected.

Votes cast (Men and Women) for School Committee (Three Years), Municipal Election, 1898.

Wards.	WILLIAM F. MERRITT,* Dem.	J. CARLETON NICHOLS,* Com. 100, I. W., P. S. Ass'n, Rep.	A. KIDDER PAGE, Com. 100, I. W., Rep.	CHARLES S. STONE, Rep.	J. LORING THAYER, Rep.	Scattering.
1.....	918	1,679	1,432	1,133	1,121	
2.....	1,627	529	446	385	360	
3.....	1,197	574	484	325	228	
4.....	879	659	580	448	417	1
5.....	974	561	470	365	338	
6.....	1,401	443	338	335	310	
7.....	795	419	337	303	247	
8.....	1,136	658	517	451	416	
9.....	1,264	690	514	491	446	
10.....	348	1,516	1,134	712	697	
11.....	356	2,111	1,007	568	556	10
12.....	694	1,381	937	690	645	
13.....	1,632	288	175	202	178	
14.....	1,601	1,434	884	679	590	
15.....	1,201	1,027	696	493	467	
16.....	1,008	1,281	918	720	754	
17.....	1,547	868	673	622	536	
18.....	1,075	768	595	894	498	
19.....	1,638	695	545	761	451	
20.....	1,236	2,122	1,413	1,087	1,210	
21.....	687	2,090	1,416	1,010	962	1
22.....	1,041	1,512	1,109	965	816	1
23.....	1,050	1,661	1,106	889	785	
24.....	1,115	1,869	1,394	946	1,329	
25.....	1,008	1,290	875	638	613	
Totals	27,428	28,125	19,995	16,112	14,970	

* Elected.

**Votes cast (Men and Women) for School Committee (One Year),
Municipal Election, 1898.**

Wards.	FREDERICK S. BENNETT,* Com. 100, I. W., Rep.	WILLIAM ROSNOSKY, Dem.	Scattering.
1.....	1,904	848	
2.....	617	1,543	
3.....	653	1,234	
4.....	750	859	
5.....	655	910	
6.....	576	1,395	
7.....	481	843	
8.....	794	1,155	
9.....	721	1,334	
10.....	1,588	425	
11.....	1,933	351	
12.....	1,348	764	
13.....	265	1,737	
14.....	1,198	1,694	
15.....	930	1,318	
16.....	1,324	1,086	1
17.....	955	1,582	
18.....	847	1,189	
19.....	895	1,771	
20.....	2,319	1,087	1
21.....	2,146	783	
22.....	1,740	1,089	
23.....	1,745	1,061	
24.....	2,047	990	
25.....	1,412	951	
Totals	29,843	27,999	2

* Elected.

Number of Women Registered Who Voted for School Committee.
 (AS PER WARD OFFICERS' RETURNS OF NAMES CHECKED ON
 VOTING LIST) AT MUNICIPAL ELECTION, 1898.

Wards.	PRECINCTS.									Number of names checked.	Number regis- tered.	Per cent. regis- tered who voted.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.			
1	43	69	89	49	54	4	15	23	8	354	569	62.21
2	14	15	10	18	10	13	4	2	86	129	66.67
3	78	24	25	8	10	4	149	247	60.32
4	20	42	52	38	9	13	174	289	60.21
5	34	28	5	14	20	5	106	196	54.08
6	1	6	3	2	7	7	2	0	28	76	36.84
7	7	14	21	10	15	15	82	139	58.99
8	1	12	19	16	6	1	55	113	48.67
9	10	12	3	5	43	41	7	121	196	61.73
10	10	22	37	35	13	29	42	31	18	237	403	58.81
11	52	10	53	38	17	26	29	26	14	265	435	60.92
12	51	66	43	49	36	23	26	294	444	66.22
13	2	8	4	8	9	14	10	4	59	122	48.36
14	28	7	40	64	86	55	48	18	346	520	66.54
15	14	13	32	54	35	65	46	23	282	436	64.68
16	28	19	25	38	27	34	13	184	359	51.25
17	4	9	50	33	9	2	15	22	18	162	288	56.25
18	20	22	30	33	10	45	160	251	63.75
19	10	21	4	20	24	27	25	6	137	216	63.43
20	58	66	43	12	23	37	61	33	333	661	50.38
21	48	34	23	80	51	68	22	56	40	422	729	57.89
22	31	15	14	39	15	35	56	30	235	333	70.57
23	31	4	13	19	46	63	45	28	17	266	437	60.87
24	12	28	45	22	37	40	77	68	19	348	641	54.29
25	39	53	77	18	44	49	36	316	494	63.97
Totals										5,201	8,723	

Average per cent. of women registered who voted, 59.62.

Number of Men Registered Who Voted
(AS PER WARD OFFICERS' RETURNS OF NAMES CHECKED
ON VOTING LISTS) AT MUNICIPAL ELECTION, 1898.


Wards.	PRECINCTS.									Number of names checked.	Number regis- tered.	Percent regis- tered who voted.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.			
1..	274	304	404	365	338	340	429	438	174	3,066	4,226	72.55
2..	367	266	353	322	277	337	390	440	2,752	3,931	70.01
3..	297	399	357	433	444	356	2,286	3,110	73.50
4..	347	231	330	361	387	246	1,902	2,744	69.31
5..	310	407	343	233	372	266	1,931	2,869	67.31
6..	335	375	393	372	403	220	357	349	2,804	4,174	67.18
7..	222	250	277	210	350	356	1,665	2,530	65.81
8..	474	452	271	509	541	492	2,739	3,693	74.17
9..	381	403	394	381	334	262	411	2,566	3,775	67.97
10..	212	245	225	213	143	248	351	342	202	2,181	4,030	54.12
11..	321	337	348	329	272	225	292	263	234	2,621	3,954	66.29
12..	327	305	261	331	276	421	331	2,252	3,483	64.66
13..	343	398	342	380	351	291	358	295	2,758	3,986	69.19
14..	550	489	347	339	379	343	405	393	3,245	4,515	71.87
15..	203	327	333	321	329	319	330	355	2,517	3,757	66.99
16..	300	339	450	412	352	336	501	2,690	3,968	67.79
17..	336	335	295	358	300	321	340	431	325	3,041	4,288	70.92
18..	397	388	334	473	509	481	2,582	3,885	66.46
19..	370	358	480	400	328	390	496	433	3,255	4,528	71.89
20..	490	480	390	427	509	461	473	430	3,660	5,385	67.97
21..	320	350	230	335	347	317	384	378	358	3,019	4,496	67.15
22..	553	428	351	444	396	313	361	416	3,262	4,579	71.24
23..	281	383	379	364	470	397	319	337	216	3,146	4,152	75.77
24..	330	309	397	322	309	339	403	499	322	3,230	4,807	67.19
25..	370	348	325	360	381	379	415	2,578	3,592	71.77
Totals										67,748	98,457	

Average per cent. of men registered who voted, 68.81.

Votes cast on the Question : Shall Licenses be Granted for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors in this City? — Municipal Election, 1898.

Wards.	Yes.	No.
1	1,473	1,204
2	1,525	763
3	1,126	795
4	886	734
5	1,038	613
6	1,532	662
7	865	463
8	1,467	674
9	1,312	810
10	1,157	807
11	1,603	698
12	1,156	823
13	1,242	966
14	1,509	1,357
15	1,142	1,081
16	1,306	1,096
17	1,567	1,038
18	1,250	906
19	1,849	989
20	1,604	1,724
21	1,506	1,248
22	1,792	1,132
23	1,451	1,397
24	1,281	1,627
25	1,429	865
Totals.....	34,068	24,472

Proportion of men registered who voted 59.46 per cent.



B. P. L. Bindery.
DEC 26 1911

FRAGILE

DO NOT
PHOTOCOPY